DOCUMENT RESUME

CG 002 781

ED 022 229

By-Hedlund, Dalva E.

AN EVALUATION OF COUNSELING AND RELATED SERVICES IN NEW YORK STATE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES.

Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. School of Education.
Spons Agency-New York State Education Dept., Albany.
Pub Date Jun 68
Note-100p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.08
Descriptors-*COMMUNITY COLLEGES, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *STATE SURVEYS, STUDENT OPINION, *STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

A questionnaire measuring (1) the perceived evaluation of 23 student personnel services, (2) estimates of the relative frequency of selected student problems, and (3) opinions about counseling was administered to randomly selected samples of public two-year college faculty, students, and counselors. An instrument to measure the performance of specific counseling activities was administered to counselors, and data pertaining to work experience, educational background, and present professional duties were collected. Information about participating two-year colleges was also collected. The amount of student personnel services and the amount of counseling services available, measured by a ratio of staff to students, does have a strong positive effect on the proportion of students completing a program of study. Reasons for the high attrition rates of two-year college students were noted. These were largely problems which could be alleviated by adequate counseling and student personnel services. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF COUNSELING AND RELATED SERVICES IN NEW YORK STATE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Dalva E. Hedlund
Principal Investigator

Joe P. Bail A. Gordon Nelson
Research Consultants

ED022229

Department of Education
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
Ithaca, New York
June, 1968

CG 002 781

Summary

A general questionnaire measuring the perceived evaluation of 23 student personnel services, estimates of the relative frequency of selected student problems, and opinions about counseling was administered to randomly selected samples of public two-year college faculty, students, and counselors in New York State. In addition, an instrument to measure the performance of specific counseling activities was administered to counselors, and data pertaining to work experience, educational background, and present professional duties were collected from counselors. Descriptive information about participating two-year colleges was also collected.

It was found that the amount of student personnel services and the amount of counseling services available, measured by a ratio of staff to students, does have a strong positive effect on the proportion of students completing a program of study. A number of possible reasons for the high attrition rates of two-year college students were noted, and it was evident that these were largely problems which could be alleviated by adequate counseling and student personnel services.

Evening students could hardly be said to be receiving any counseling. This was indicated (1) by the number of counselors assigned to evening divisions, (2) by the amount of work time counselors reported spending with evening students, and (3) by the evening students' evaluation of counseling and student personnel services and their attitudes toward counseling.

There was generally a large discrepancy between the student personnel functions that counselors said were being performed and the student personnel functions that students said were being performed. Even faculty members were relatively uninformed about the performance of many functions. A definite need for better communication between the student personnel staff and other college groups was indicated. In any case, the planning for, and evaluation of, student personnel services should take the student's viewpoint into account.

Students were the severest critics of the performance of student personnel functions. A bias in the evaluation of student personnel functions by counselors was evident, particularly when the functions dealt with activities associated with the counselor's "professional identity." Those functions which were evaluated most poorly could be characterized as the organization, administration, and development of student personnel services.

The greatest need which counselors identified for the immediate improvement of counseling is the expanded use of all types of standardized testing procedures. Related to this need, more training in testing was suggested, both in graduate school and through in-service programs.

The need for more definitive research on the two-year college student became evident at several points throughout the study, resulting in many more questions than answers. Some of these questions were: What kinds of information (and from what sources) does the student need for the decisions he has to make? Where do students go when they withdraw or complete a program of study? Why does such a large proportion of students fail? Many of these questions could be approached through adequate institutional research, which was not being performed at many of the participating colleges.

The characteristics of, and comments by, the counselors could have some significant implications for the design of graduate education experiences for future counselors and other student personnel staff members. Probably the best summary of the counselors' recommendations would be that graduate training should be psychological in content rather than educational.

It is suggested that the instruments developed for this study, or modifications thereof, would be appropriate to utilize for institutional research on student personnel services. It should be re-emphasized that institutional studies, even of an elementary nature, are of the utmost importance if counseling and other student personnel services in the two-year college are to be improved.

AN EVALUATION OF COUNSELING AND RELATED SERVICES IN NEW YORK STATE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

What is the "state of the art" in counseling and related services in the public two-year colleges in New York?

This general question was the basis for the present study by the Department of Education, Cornell University, supported by the New York State Education Department. Two general purposes were developed to guide the study:

(1) To determine what counseling and student personnel services were available in two-year colleges; and (2) To evaluate these services.

The fulfillment of these two purposes would lead to a sounder basis for projecting needs in counseling and student personnel services, for improving existing services, for training counselors and student personnel administrators, and for planning future research.

It was apparent, however, that the task was not a simple one. First, there is extreme diversity among two-year colleges, resulting in varied student personnel organizations with a variety of tasks to perform. Second, individuals at a given college could not agree on what counseling or student personnel services were offered. This lack of agreement was partially due to the lack of uniformity in tasks performed under the "student personnel" organization, partially due to the lack of professional identity in the field in general, and largely due to a lack of an accepted professional jargon with which student personnel tasks could be described. Third, there are no satisfactory criteria applicable to a wide variety of situations by which counseling or other student personnel services could be evaluated. Very few individual colleges, for example, have taken the effort to develop a set of educational objectives for their institution to which student personnel activities could be related and objectively evaluated. There has been even less effort, or perhaps less success, in defining objectives for the general field of student personnel administration.

The problems of adequately defining the specific tasks involved in student personnel administration, and more specifically in counseling, together with the criterion problem and the limited resources for this study led to the development of a particular methodology to achieve the purposes of the study.

Methodology

It was decided that a comparison of evaluations of student personnel services, particularly counseling, made by groups familiar with these services would yield the most meaningful immediate information. Three groups were chosen: 1) faculty members, who are primarily responsible for referring students to counselors and other members of the student personnel staff, and who should be concerned with the results of student personnel services on students; 2) students themselves, the consumers of student personnel services; and 3) counselors, since the study emphasized the counseling function and these individuals should be in the best position to fully evaluate services offered, as well as furnish personal information about their own education and professional experience.

In addition, some rather comprehensive data about the characteristics of each two-year college was collected. It was found that little meaningful information about institutional or student characteristics was available elsewhere. The primary purpose of collecting institutional data was to develop a description of the two-year college population being studied, but a number of interesting analyses also resulted.

The General Questionnaire

A general questionnaire consisting of three parts was constructed for administration to faculty, students, and counselors. In addition, an instrument relating to specific counseling activities was designed for counselors. In the following sections the instruments utilized in the study are described.

The most acceptable definition of student personnel functions in the two-year college was found in Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development (Raines, 1965). In this study, the only published systematic attempt to evaluate student personnel programs in two-year colleges, 23 basic functions were identified. These functions, 23 in number for faculty and counselors, 16 for students, constituted the first section, Part I, of the rating instrument. This section was entitled "Faculty (Student, or Counselor) Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions" (Appendix A). Faculty and counselors were asked to rate all 23 functions in their respective colleges. Students, due to a lack of familiarity with the internal administration of their colleges, were asked to rate the first 16 functions.

A five-point constant response rating scale was developed to accompany each item (Table 1). Two types of information were tapped by the response scale: 1) whether the respondent had knowledge of the performance of a function at his college; and 2) an evaluation of the performance of a function at his college in terms of two dimensions, the quantity and the quality of such performance. In effect, the rating scale resulted in a four-point continuum of evaluation for each item or in one response to indicate that the respondent did not know an item was performed at his college.

Table 1

Instructions for Completing the Ratings in Part I;
Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions

Listed below are several functions which could be classified as "student personnel" functions. Utilizing the following scale, please circle the appropriate number following each function which most nearly indicates your own opinion of how well each function is performed at your college.

NP Not Performed, or I have absolutely no knowledge of the performance of this function.

1. Poor. Function is performed, but is entirely inadequate.

2. Fair. Function is performed, but the quality and/or quantity of services does not meet the needs of the college or students.
3. Satisfactory. Function is performed in an acceptable manner, with room for improvement in quality or broadening of application.
4. Outstanding. Function is performed in an excellent manner. Difficult to improve either the quality or quantity of services.

For example, under "Precollege Information" you may think that the handling of inquiries concerning college attendance is handled well, but there should be many more activities added under this function. You would probably circle "2" for this function.

In Part II of the instrument (Appendix A) the respondent was requested to rank the relative frequency of seven student problems. Part II was administered to all three groups of respondents. The classification of types of problems did not necessarily result in completely independent categories, but the categories utilized are readily understood by laymen and are widely used in counselor training. A category of "mixed or combination problems" was included because of the difficulty in specifying whether a student would ever be included exclusively in one category such as "vocational problems." It was expected, then, that the "mixed or combination" category would be perceived as the most common, particularly by counselors.

The rationale for requesting a rating of student problems by all three groups was much the same as for the rest of the instrument. Do counselors, students, and faculty perceive counseling problems similarly? If not, can the differences in ratings be explained?

The final sections of the general instrument, Part III, was termed "Attitude Toward Counseling and Counseling Services" (Appendix A). This section, comprised of six general opinion items, was designed to measure attitudes toward professional counseling services in two-year colleges. In some of the items the respondent was directly asked to indicate his opinion about counseling by circling one of the alternative responses. For example, "What is your opinion about providing special guidance and counseling services for students in two-year colleges?" (Item 1). Other items were designed to indirectly elicit general attitudes or were focused on more specific aspects of counseling.

An attempt was made to place alternative responses to each of the opinion items on a unidimensional continuum of favorability. In this manner, responses should have the same interpretation, but indicate differing degrees of favorability. Part III was also administered to all three groups of respondents.

Inventory of Counseling Services

As the study was concerned particularly with counseling services, one instrument was designed for rating specific activities which might be subsumed under "counseling" at a particular institution (Appendix B). An informal taxomony of activities was constructed under the general headings of appraisal, consultation, and referral. After editing and consolidating approximately 30 statements about counseling activities, a list of 22 items was included in the inventory. The same response scale developed for the Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions, Part I, was utilized for the Inventory of Counseling Services. One change in the description of responses was made. "NP" meant only not performed. The statement "I have absolutely no knowledge of the performance of this function" was dropped since it was assumed that all counselors, the group the inventory was administered to, would be familiar with all counseling activities at their college. Examination of counselor returns from individual colleges proved this assumption wrong, however.

Personal Characteristics of Respondents

Faculty and student questionnaires each included a brief personal data sheet (Appendix C). Variables which might be related to responses to the instruments were included on this sheet. In addition, students were asked about plans following completion of two-year college work, and about personal use of the counseling services at their college.

An extensive personal inventory was administered to counselors. The Inventory of Staff Resources (Appendix D) is a modified version of an inventory developed by Raines (1965). The inventory was designed to yield a description of the professional experience, education, and duties of the two-year college counselor.

Institutional Information Questionnaire

A considerable amount of information about individual two-year colleges was needed to derive 1) a comprehensive description of colleges and student population in the study, and 2) various indices such as counselor-student ratios. The Institutional Information Questionnaire (IIQ) was designed for this purpose (Appendix E). Items in the IIQ were of two general types: (1) closed-end items requesting factual information or estimates of factual information; and (2) open-end items requesting estimates or opinions. The IIQ was designed to yield rather complete information about student body characteristics, faculty characteristics, and student personnel staff.

Pilot Projects

After the initial instruments described above were constructed and edited, five deans of students and counselors from two-year colleges met for a full day to review the research plan and individual instruments. The purpose of reviewing the entire study with experienced consultants from two-year colleges was to insure the feasibility of the research plan, to edit each item for clarity and reading level appropriate for two-year college students and to reach agreement that information requested was available as well as meaningful. A major revision of the IIQ resulted from this review, in addition to a number of changes in individual items in the instruments.

Following revision of the instruments, a pilot administration of the IIQ student questionnaires and counselor questionnaires was conducted at Corning Community College. A total of 43 student questionnaires were administered to a class in introductory psychology. These students were urged to write comments about any aspect of the questionnaires which was not easily understood. In addition, the class was questioned by the investigator about any problems in completing the questionnaire. The IIQ was completed with no suggestions for changes. Three counselor questionnaires were also completed, with no comments except that the time required was too long.

It was found that responses to all rating items were distributed acceptably. There were no major revisions needed as a result of the Corning pretest.

Summary of the Instruments

Three groups of subjects were utilized to obtain relative evaluations of counseling and other student personnel functions: Faculty, students, and counselors. It was hypothesized that a comparison of the perceptions of these three groups would yield meaningful information about the current student personnel services offered and about changes needed in these services. In addition, counselors were asked to evaluate specific counseling activities at their college and to furnish rather complete information about their own professional experience, education, and professional duties.

An Institutional Information Questionnaire was constructed to yield descriptions of the student body, faculty, and student personnel staff of each participating institution.

A summary of the instruments administered to specific groups is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Instruments Administered to Specific Groups and Average Completion Time

Instrument	Administered to:	Completion Time
Part I: Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions	Faculty, Counselors, Students (16 items)	10 minutes 8 minutes
Part II: Relative Frequency of Student Problems	Faculty, Students, Counselors	3 minutes
Part III: Attitude Toward Counseling and Counseling Services	Faculty, Studetns, Counselors	3 minutes
Personal Information Sheet	Faculty, Students	1 minute
Inventory of Staff Resources	Counselors	30 minutes
Inventory of Counseling Services	Counselors	5 minutes

Approximately 15 to 17 minutes were required of students and faculty members to respond to their questionnaires. Counselors needed about 50 minutes to finish their complete questionnaire packet. It was felt that the time required of students and faculty would not affect the rate of questionnaire returns. The approximate 50 minutes required of counselors was a sizable amount of time to take from an already crowded schedule. However, counselors should have been the persons most interested in the results of the study and therefore more willing to expend the time completing questionnaires.

Data Collection

The institutional population defined for the study was the 38 existing public two-year colleges in New York State. Each of these colleges was asked to participate in the study.

Considering the purposes and resources of the study, it was decided to randomly sample students and faculty in proportion to the size of each institution. Samples of each group large enough in number to yield accurate estimates of responses of the total two-year college student and faculty populations in New York were required. It was estimated that a sample size of 271 would yield a frequency of responses to any given item which does not vary more than 5% from actual frequency of responses to that item in the total population more than one time in ten. Stated otherwise, the responses of a sample of 271 would be expected to be representative of total population responses at least 90% of the time. It was arbitrarily decided that this would be an acceptable degree of accuracy for this study.

Using estimates of total student enrollment in two-year colleges from the State University of New York, [1] and estimates of the number of faculty members from Gleazer (1967), it was decided that a sampling of 1% of the total student enrollment (including evening students) and 10% of all faculty (including part-time) would result in acceptable sample sizes even if there was a large proportion of questionnaires not returned.

---

[1] Personal communication from the Division of Institutional Research, State University of New York.

All counselors were sent a questionnaire since there was a relatively small population of counselors and a major portion of the study focused on counselors. A "counselor" was defined, for purposes of the study as an individual who was: (1) identified as a counselor by job title and/or (2) spent more than approximately 35% of his work time in counseling activities. This information was taken from the IIQ returned by each participating institution. Medical, housing, and community relations staff were excluded from this definition of counselor, even though it was indicated that they spent a major proportion of their work time in "counseling" activities.

To insure the best possible rate of returns and the highest degree of accuracy for institutional information, the dean of students at each institution was asked to appoint a counselor as the "campus coordinator" for this study. The campus coordinator was responsible for the conduct of the study at his college.

An intitial set of instructions and an IIQ were sent to each campus coordinator. The coordinator's role was to:

1) Complete the IIQ
2) Furnish a listing of all students and faculty at his college
3) Distribute, collect, and return all questionnaires sent to his college

It was felt that a counselor, familiar with his college, could most easily and most accurately furnish the information requested on the IIQ. A list of faculty and students was requested so the investigator could randomly sample these groups. This procedure was followed to minimize the time the coordinator would need to devote to the study, and to insure that samples of students and faculty from each campus were picked randomly. Since the coordinator would have the possibilities of personal contact and an on-campus follow-up of questionnaire returns, he was chosen to distribute and collect questionnaires over other alternative methods of distribution such as a direct mailing to the respondent. Directions were printed at the end of each questionnaire for the respondent to return the completed questionnaire either to the Dean of Students office or to the person forwarding the questionnaire to him. A blank envelope was included with each questionnaire to enclose the completed instruments and insure confidentiality of responses.

It should be noted that in a few instances institutional policy would not allow the release of a listing of students and/or faculty. There were also a few other cases where the institution did not decide to participate until the study was almost completed. In these cases, the campus coordinator randomly sampled 1% of the student population and 10% of the faculty population, and requested an appropriate number of questionnaires for distribution.

There was no systematic attempt to follow up subjects not returning questionnaires. A list of the names of individuals to whom questionnaires were sent was forwarded to the coordinators that furnished a complete student and faculty list. The decision to later request individuals to return questionnaires was left to the coordinator.

Results

This section of the report will be organized around the several types of data relating to the different instruments employed in the study. Since the study was exploratory in nature, the data were most often treated in a descriptive manner. Likewise, the use of statistical tests of hypotheses was minimized for a number of reasons. The measurements collected were necessarily gross in many instances, not yielding scales which would substantiate the use of many types of statistics. Moreover, it was felt that due to the exploratory nature of the study and the types of comparisons between variables desired, most important relationships should be strong enough to be apparent from a visual inspection of the data. With these considerations, statistical tests were limited to the use of chi square for the analysis of the independence of variables. All analyses were programmed on an IBM 360/65 computer system.

Rate of Return

Of the total 38 public two-year colleges in New York State, two had not admitted students and could not participate in the study, and at eight colleges the decision was made not to participate in the study. This left a possible of 28 participating colleges to which IIQ's and campus coordinator instructions were sent. Completed IIQ's were returned from 26 institutions, a return rate of 93%. However, one of the returning colleges had just admitted the first class of students so this data were not utilized in analyses. A list of participating two-year colleges is included in Appendix F.

Questionnaires were sent to 28 colleges, of which 27 (96%) returned some completed instruments. The rate of return of all three types of questionnaires (faculty, students, and counselors) for individual colleges ranged from .7% to 100%, with an overall return of 41% (Table 3).

Table 3

Number of Instruments
Sent and Returned

Instrument	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percentage Return
IIQ	28	26	93
Questionnaire			
Total	1,560	641	41
Student	882	316	36
Faculty	498	215	43
Counselor	180	110	61

The overall rate of questionnaire returns was less than anticipated, particularly for students. As expected, the highest rate of return was found among counselors. There is always a question of the representativeness of responses when a large proportion of individuals do not respond, since the characteristic of not responding may be related to attitudes or other relevant personal characteristics. It should be noted, however, that the total student sample (316) is greater than the number determined to yield an acceptable level of accuracy of responses. The faculty sample (215) approached an acceptable degree of confidence. The 61% return of counselor questionnaires was in the expected range for all three groups. It should also be noted that the study was not designed to make comparisons of the evaluations of counseling and student personnel services between individual colleges. The number of respondents from any one institution, even though randomly chosen, was too small to represent the responses of the population at that college. Rather, the study was designed to obtain an overall evaluation of these services in New York State, and to make comparisons between the evaluations of different groups.

The IIQ: Factual Information

Responses to the factual items of the IIQ are given in Table 4. The number of colleges responding is indicated for each item. This number varies somewhat from item to item either because the information was not available at particular institutions or because the item was not interpreted correctly at some institutions and the data could not be used. The items, as well as responses, are listed in Table 4, since the interpretation of the figures reported is often dependent upon the particular wording of the item.

Table 4

Summary of Institutional Information Questionnaire Data

N=25[1]	1. Please use Fall, 1967, figures as reported to SUNY.[2]	
	(1) Total student enrollment	T=87,837, M=3,513, R=189-11,518
	(2) Number of men	T=52,107, M=2,081, R=120- 7,430
	(3) Number of women	T=35,602, M=1,424, R= 69- 4,760
	(4) Number enrolled as full-time students (12 hours or more)	T=44,719, M=1,789, R= 94- 3,981
	(5) Number enrolled as part-time students (less than 12 hours), excluding evening students	T= 6,279, M= 251, R= 5- 3,596
	(6) Number of students enrolled in evening classes only	T=43,169, M=1,727, R= 0- 7,497

[1] N=number of colleges reporting, T=total for all colleges reporting, M=arithmetic mean for N schools, R=range of figures reported.

[2] Errors in completing individual questionnaires account for the discrepancy on the total figures of this and following items

(Table 4 cont.)

N=25 2. Of all students currently enrolled at your college, and counting part-time enrollment as full attendance, what percentage are:

(1) in their first year of attendance at your college M=63%, R=23-100%

(2) in their second year of attendance at your college M=30%, R= 0- 43%

(3) currently in their third or more year of attendance at your college M= 6%, R= 0- 25%

N=23 3. Approximate number of full-time students who are married:

Men: T=769, M=33, R=4-60; Women: T=446, M=20, R=2-37

N=19 4. Approximate number of full-time students 20 years of age or older:

T=4,207, M=221, R=10-1,063

N=23 5. Percent of full-time students receiving financial aid administered by your college, excluding Scholar Incentive and Regents Scholarships and including on-campus part-time work:
M=23%, R=7-56%

N=23 6. Homes of students:

Please indicate the percentages of full-time students who:
(1) live at home M=63%, R=10-100%
(2) live away from home M=37%, R=0=90%

N=21 8. Of every 100 newly enrolled, full-time freshmen in your college, estimate as closely as possible how many:

(1) leave during the first year without completing a program of study M=28%, R=10-50%

(2) complete a program of study during the first year M= 2%, R= 0-30%

(3) leave during the second year without completing a program of study M=18%, R= 6-40%

(4) complete a program of study during the second year M=48%, R=20-71%

Total 100%

(Table 4 cont.)

N=19 10. Please estimate the total number of students during 66/67 school year who:

(1) transferred to a four-year institution	T=3,982, M=210, R=15- 800
(2) transferred to other than a four-year institution	T= 260, M= 14, R= 0- 50
(3) entered gainful employment	T=5,597, M=295, R=10-1,400

12. Please list those agencies which have accredited your college:

mean number of agencies which have accredited the college =2.36

N=25 13. Number of teaching faculty:

(1) Full-time	T=2,859, M=114, R=6-359
(2) Part-time	
(a) in day division	T= 383, M= 15, R=0- 85
(b) in evening division	T=2,329, M= 93, R=0-559

Academic degrees of teaching faculty:

	Number of: N=25 Full-time	N=23 Part-time
with Doctorate	(1) T= 297, M=12, R=0- 55	(4) T=123, M= 6, R=0- 50
with Masters	(2) T=2,027, M=81, R=6-200	(5) T=851, M=37, R=0-250
with less than Masters	(3) T= 616, M=25, R=0-92	(6) T=600, M=26, R=0-147

N=25 14. Student Personnel Staff

Please list below the names and titles of all the full- and part-time members of the student personnel staff.

	T=315, M=13, R=3-41
Full-time:	T=300, M=12, R=3-41
Part-time:	T= 15, M=,60, R=0-3

Number of counselors (adding %of time in counseling)
T=152, M= 6, R=1.8-12.7

The 25 colleges reporting enrolled 87,837 students, of which almost half (43,169) were evening students only. The "average" public two-year college in New York State enrolls approximately 3, 513 students. This total for the average college is comprised of 2,040 day students and 1,727 evening students, these figures illustrate a major difficulty in the data reported on the IIQ: responses from individual colleges were not internally consistent. Here, for example, the sum of the full-time, part-time, and evening student enrollment does not equal the total enrollment. Rather than try to interpret what reported figures meant when they were internally inconsistent, these figures were utilized in calculations with the assumption that the order-of-magnitude approximation was nearly correct.

It is evident that the attrition rate for students in colleges sampled is high. An average of 28% of newly-enrolled students withdraw during the first year of study. A relatively small proportion of students (6%) seem to attend two-year colleges for longer than two years. Approximately 50% of the students who enter two-year colleges complete either a one- or two-year program of study.

In spite of the implication of a "local community" college for continuing education, only a relatively small proportion of the total full-time student enrollment was over 20 years of age. The adult enrollment in evening classes would probably be much higher, but this figure was not available from most schools. Nevertheless, the number of older full-time students in individual colleges could be large enough to warrant special concern. The largest number of over-20 students reported was 1,063, larger than the total student enrollment at a number of other colleges.

Financial aid was available to a mean of 23% of full-time students. Considerable variability among colleges in the number of students receiving financial aid was found, ranging from a low of 7% to a high of 56%. Even more variability was found in the proportion of students living away from home, as high as 90% in one instance. The overall mean of students living away from home was 37%.

The areas of financial aid and housing have not received special attention in the development of student personnel services for the two-year college. With more than one-third of all full-time students living away from home, and with only nine of the 25 colleges reporting members of the student personnel staff with "housing" in the job title, it seems apparent that the housing function deserves study. Likewise, though most two-year colleges have a designated person with responsibility for administering financial aid, it would seem that a given student's chances of receiving any assistance would depend largely upon which school he applied to. The distribution of, and need for, financial aid in two-year colleges appear to deserve special attention.

Student Personnel and Counseling Staff. A total of 315 individuals are engaged in student personnel administration in the 25 two-year colleges reporting. Only 15 of this total were on a part-time basis. Total student personnel staff to number of day students ratios were calculated for each school (Table 5). The number in the total student personnel staff was calculated from the total number of individuals listed in item 14. Day students are the sum of reported full-time and part-time students exclusive of evening classes reported in item 8.

It is interesting to note that there are considerable differences among colleges in the emphasis put on student personnel services as evidenced by the spread of staff to student ratios. Almost as many colleges have a high number of students per staff member as have a low number of students per staff member.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of Total Student Personnel Staff to Number of Day Students Ratios (N=25)

Ratio	Frequency
More than 1:300	4
1:250-299	3
1:200-249	2
1:150:199	4
1:100:149	7
Less than 1:100	5

Mean = 1:167
Range = 1:33-1:471

What effect does staff to student ratio have on students? To investigate this question, the ratio variable was compared to item 8-(4), the proportion of students which complete a program of study during the second year of college attendance. This comparison is shown in Table 6. The student personnel staff to number of day students ratio was dichotomized at 1:150 since this number approximated an even split between colleges in the high ratio (more than 1:150) and low ratio (1:150 or less) categories. Likewise, a dichotomy was formed on the percentage of students completing a program of study in two years at 50%, approximating the mean percentage (48%) on this variable for all colleges.

All of the participating colleges with a total student personnel staff to student ratio of 1:150 or less reported graduating more than half of their students in two years. In comparison, only 20% of the colleges with a ratio of more than 1:150 reported that half of their students completed a program of study in two years. But, why is student personnel staff to student ratio related to the rate of completing? The lack of control over other relevant variables in the present study makes it difficult to attribute causality to any variable. Explanation can be strengthened in this case by eliminating some variables.

Table 6

Student Personnel Staff to Number of Day Students Ratio by Percentage of Students Completing a Two Year Program of Study (N=21)

Staff/Student Ratio	Percentage of Students Completing a Two-Year Program		Total
	less than 50%	50% or more	
1:150 or less	0	11 (100%)	11
more than 1:150	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	10
			21

$x^2 = 14.22^{**}$[2]
df = 1

The counselor to student ratio was examined next. This appears to be a fairly objective measure of the availability of counseling services to the student body. However, the diverse nature of student personnel organization, job titles, and actual assignments among the various two-year colleges made the calculation of this simple ratio very tenuous. Moreover, upon what student population should the ratio be based? Various possibilities existed: (1) full-time students (those taking 12 credit hours or more); (2) day student enrollment (full-time plus part-time); (3) evening student enrollment only; or (4) total student enrollment.

Since item 14 in the IIQ did ask for an estimate of percentage of total time spent in counseling, and since most individuals in student personnel (as well as most faculty) in two-year colleges do engage in some "counseling," loosely defined, it was decided to calculate an equivalent of the total number of counselors by summing the percentage of time spent in counseling for all individuals listed as student personnel staff. The job titles of these individuals ranged from dean of students, counselor, financial aids officer, and admissions counselor to housing director, nurse, director of community resources and registrar.

---

[2] The following convention will be followed throughout this paper: *Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence; **Statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

As this was a liberal definition of "counseling," it was appropriate to use a liberal definition of the student population served. This ratio was based on total student enrollment, full-time, part-time, and evening students. The distribution of equivalent counselor to total student enrollment ratios is shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Equivalent
Counselor to Total Students Ratios
(N=25)

Counselor/Student Ratio	Frequency
more than 1:950	6
1:800-949	1
1:650-799	0
1:500-649	4
1:350-499	5
less than 1:350	9

Mean = 1:577
Range= 1:105-1:1,607

As much variability is evident in this ratio as in the student personnel staff to day student ratio. However, the "equivalent counselor" definition of the number of counselors is not very accurate. A major portion of the "counseling" accomplished under this definition would be incidental to other functions. Likewise, total student enrollment is not a very precise definition of the student population served. It is likely that most effort is given to "day students."

With these considerations, "counselors" were redefined as individuals with "counselor" in their job title and/or who were designated in IIQ item 14 as spending near 100% of their time in counseling activities. The investigator applied these criteria to each individual listed under student personnel staff, and made a clinical judgment about the actual number of counselors for each college in the study. This was, admittedly, a subjective process, but it probably identified individuals engaging in professional counseling activities more accurately than was possible using alternative methods of identifying counselors. Interestingly, the number of "actual" counselors in most cases was very close to the previously calculated number of "equivalent counselors." Those counselors identified as evening staff were not counted in this calculation.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Actual
Counselor to Number of Day Students
Ratios (N=25)

Ratio	Frequency
more than 1:950	2
1:800-949	4
1:650-799	1
1:500-649	4
1:350-499	8
less than 1:350	6

Mean = 1:451
Range = 1:99-1:1,380

The student population served by actual counselors was redefined as day students, the sum of full-time and part-time students excluding evening students in each college.

The distribution of actual counselor to day students ratios is shown in Table 8. By this definition the counselor to students ratios appear to be of a more desirable magnitude. Raines (1965) recommended a counselor to student ratio of 1:350. Six of the colleges in this study surpass this recommended ratio. Two of these six colleges do so rather by default, however, since they are brand new with small student enrollments and a minimal counseling staff. The average ratio for all colleges was one counselor for 451 students.

Next, the relationship between counselor to students ratio and the proportion of students completing a program of study in two years was examined. Again, the rate of completion variable was dichotomized at less than 50% and 50% or more. Counselor to students ratios were dichotomized at less than 1:450 and 1:450 or more, since this ratio approximated the overall mean ratio for the 25 colleges. The relationship between counselor to students ratio and rate of completing is shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Actual Counselor to Day Students Ratio
by Percentage of Students Completing
a Two-Year Program of Study (N=21)

Counselor/Student Ratio	Percentage of Students Completing a Two-Year Program		Total
	less than 50%	50% of more	
1:450 or less	0	9 (100%)	9
more than 1:450	8 (67%)	4 (33%)	12

$x^2 = 9.69$**
df = 1

It is evident from Table 9 that colleges with less students per counselor report higher completion rates than do colleges with more students per counselor. Although the relationship between counselor to student ratio and rate of completion (Table 9) is not quite as striking as the relationship between student personnel staff to students ratio and rate of completion (Table 6), it seems valid to conclude that the effect of the number of professional counselors on completion contributes largely to the effect of the number of total student personnel staff on the rate of completion.

It was hypothesized that some more general variable, characterized, perhaps, as "concern for the individual student," might contribute to both favorable counselor/student ratios and favorable rates of completion. One possible measure which might tap this kind of variable would be size of the student body. Size of day student enrollment is compared to the proportion of students completing a program of study in two years in Table 10. Rate of completion tends to be more favorable in smaller colleges, but not at a statistically significant level.

Table 10

Size of Day Student Enrollment by
Percentage of Students Completing a
Two-Year Program of Study (N=21)

Day Enrollment	Percentage of Students Completing a Two-Year Program of Study		Total
	less than 50%	50% or more	
less than 2000	3 (23%)	10 (77%)	13
2000 or more	5 (63%)	3 (37%)	8
			21

$x^2 = 3.26$
df = 1

Perhaps the size of the college, then, is related to the size of the counselor/student ratio. These data are shown in Table 11. Although there is a slight tendency for smaller colleges to have more favorable counselor/student ratios, and for smaller colleges to graduate a larger proportion of students, neither of these relationships is strong enough to account for the effect of counselor/student ratios on rate of completion. Counselor/student ratio appears to have an effect on completion rate independent of size of the college, which might be an indirect measure of "concern for the individual student."

Table 11

Actual Counselor to Day Students Ratio
by Size of Day Enrollment (N=25)

Day Enrollment	Counselor to Students Ratio		Total
	less than 1:450	1:450 or more	
less than 2000	9 (53%)	8 (47%)	17
2000 or more	3 (48%)	5 (52%)	8
			21

$x^2 = .52$
df = 1

Summary. It is apparent that favorable student personnel staff to number of students ratios and, more specifically, favorable counselor to number of students ratios, are related to more favorable rates of completion in two-year college programs. Actual counselors, as defined in the study, have more specific professional responsibility for student decisions than do other members of the student personnel staff. Counselors also spend more time in personal consultation with students on academic, vocational, and personal matters than do other members of the student personnel staff. It is logical, then, to contribute a large proportion of the effect of student personnel staff/students ratio on completion rate to counselor/students ratio. This is especially true since the size of counselor/students and student personnel staff/students ratios are closely correlated.

The Forgotten Student

The evening student deserves a small section exclusively to himself. Only four of the colleges returning IIQ data reported having evening counselors, someone with a title designating responsibilities in the evening division. These four colleges had the following counselor/evening students ratios: 1:3155, 1:2499, 1:1200, and 1:105. Only one of these ratios would appear to give a student a chance to talk seriously with a counselor. This leaves 22 of the 26 reporting colleges with no designated evening division counselors. Stated otherwise, 26,754 evening students enrolled in colleges sampled in this study were reported to have no access to a counselor.

The IIQ: Expert Opinion

Three of the items in the IIQ were open-end questions, requiring an educated guess (or empirical data if available) from the campus coordinator. Although the responses to these items were simply opinions, they were of the nature of "expert opinion" since all campus coordinators were familiar with their college and its students.

Item 7 was: "In your judgement, what are the main reasons why some students shift from one curriculum to another?" Responses to this item were the most difficult to categorize, and this item was most often not answered. However, it seemed like an important question. Two-year college students, perhaps more so than students in other institutions of higher learning, seem to have considerable difficulty perservering in one program of study. This difficulty could contribute partially to the high attrition rates.

The reasons cited for curriculum change most often related to academic or vocational counseling. Examples of these reasons were: "Inappropriate career advisement;" "Unrealistic self-appraisal;" "Little knowledge of courses to be taken;" or simply, "Inadequate guidance." The next type of reason most often mentioned had to do with a lack of goals or no real commitment to learning, which can be interpreted as a lack of counseling. Parental pressure to major in a program and the prestige of various programs were mentioned as reasons for change in some instances, as was avoidance of the draft. Inappropriate curriculum choice due to a lack of ability was often cited, again a counseling subject.

If the perceptions of the campus coordinators are correct, adequate counseling early in the student's college career might alleviate many of the problems related to changing from one curriculum to another.

Item 9 was designed to elicit factors resulting in the high attrition rate of two-year college students. "In your experience, what are the main reasons why some students leave your college without graduating?" Again, many of the reasons mentioned were counseling and/or other student personnel problems. In order of descending frequency, these reasons were: (the frequency of each reason is included in parentheses)

1. Poor grades (16)
2. Personal problems, generally mentioning parents (13)
3. Poor motivation, lack of interest, lack of discipline (12)
4. Finances (11)
5. Transfer to another institution, including four-year colleges (9)
6. Marriage (7)
7. Selective Service (6)
8. Change in career goals; dissatisfaction with curriculum (5 each)

Health, poor preparation for college, received enough training for a job, and inadequate goals all were mentioned less than four times.

It seems contradictory that the most frequent reason for withdrawing from two-year colleges before completion of a program of study should be poor grades. The "open-door" must close on many students soon after admission. This is an area of real research need. The psychological effect of failing in a two-year college, which offers an education to all, could be quite serious. If the accepted policy is to admit all students, then the policy should also be to develop all students to the limit of their potential. What changes are needed to reduce withdrawal due to failure?

Information about what happens to "dropouts" after they leave college was requested in item 11. Almost without exception, the expected behaviors were listed on all returns: (1) obtain jobs; (2) enter military service; (3) marriage; (4) transfer to another institution; (5) return for evening study while working. Although there was a lack of definitive data on where students go when leaving two-year colleges, the estimates reported on the IIQ indicate that considerably more than half the students leaving colleges last year entered employment rather than transferring to a four-year institution. Since the type of counseling services and placement services offered by a college need to be geared to the needs of its students, this kind of information is most important. Institutional follow-up studies of students leaving college should be of prime importance. The difficulty encountered in obtaining relatively simple follow-up data, however, indicates that this type of study is not being conducted.

Ratings from the General Questionnaire: Part I

A comparison of ratings by the three respondent groups was conducted to yield two-kinds of information:

1) Differences between group evaluations of the performance of each function.
2) Estimates of the extent to which faculty and students were familiar with the various student personnel functions being performed.

The ratings of each of the 23 functions in the Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions by each respondent group (faculty, students, or counselors) were put into tabular form for ease of presentation. The chi square statistic was utilized to test the independence of ratings and group membership. Chi square was calculated only on response categories 1, 2, 3, and 4. Not Performed (NP) was excluded from the statistical test for two reasons. First, a large variation in the number of individuals between groups responding with "NP" was expected. The frequency of NP responses for counselors, for instance, was expected to be zero for a number of functions while the frequency of NP responses by students to the same items could have been large. Second, the NP response was defined as a non-evaluative response while numbered responses were evaluative. By excluding NP response from the calculation of chi square, the statistic was utilized only to test the differences between the evaluation of each function by members of each group familiar with that function.

Since counselors should be familiar with all or most of the student personnel activities at their college, the NP frequency for counselors should accurately indicate the extent of performance of any function. Therefore, the difference between the NP frequency for counselors and the NP frequency for students or faculty should be an indirect estimate of the extent to which any function is being used by students or is affecting life on the campus. No statistical tests of the differences in frequency of NP responses between groups were calculated.

Performance of the precollege information function was rated somewhat higher by both faculty and counselors than by students (Table 12). Perhaps students, being experienced at searching for information about colleges, are in a better position to realistically evaluate this function than either of the other groups. However, 22% of the students indicated that they did not know this function was performed at all. It would appear that these students did not receive much information about their colleges prior to enrollment.

Table 12

Group Ratings of Precollege Information Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	12 (6%)	53 (25%)	96 (44%)	23 (11%)	32 (15%)
Students	38 (12%)	84 (27%)	102 (32%)	24 (8%)	69 (22%)
Counselors	8 (8%)	31 (30%)	50 (48%)	11 (10%)	5 (5%)

$x^2 = 13.17^*$
df = 6

No consistent differences were found between group ratings of the applicant counsulting function (Table 13). All three groups were in agreement that the performance of this function, involving the explanation of curricular requirements, assisting in course selection, and other pre-enrollment advising activities, could be improved considerably.

Table 13

Group Ratings of Applicant Consulting Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	21 (10%)	56 (26%)	85 (39%)	15 (7%)	39 (18%)
Students	45 (15%)	98 (31%)	99 (31%)	26 (8%)	47 (15%)
Counselors	13 (12%)	46 (44%)	33 (31%)	7 (7%)	6 (6%)

$x^2 = 11.57$
df = 6

All three groups responded about an equal proportion of time to NP for the student registration function (Table 14). Evidently, this function is one that everyone in a college is exposed to, but still about 5% of all groups indicated they had no knowledge of the activity. No significant differences between the group ratings of the student registration function were noted. Most students, counselors, and faculty felt registration was performed in an acceptable manner.

Table 14

Groups Ratings of Student Registration Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	20 (9%)	62 (29%)	103 (48%)	18 (8%)	13 (6%)
Students	45 (14%)	75 (24%)	140 (44%)	43 (14%)	14 (4%)
Counselors	12 (11%)	28 (27%)	55 (52%)	5 (5%)	5 (5%)

$x^2 = 12.28$

df = 6

As shown in Table 15, counselors tended to be more critical of the performance of the academic regulation function than either faculty or students. It may be that both counselors and faculty see this function as a faculty responsibility. Thus, counselors interpret it as performed rather poorly while the faculty sees it performed relatively well.

A trend in the comparative form of the response frequencies of the three groups is evident in Table 15. Students generally showed less agreement in their ratings of a function and were more likely to utilize extreme ratings than either faculty or counselors. Likewise, more students than either of the other groups were apt to indicate that they do not know a function is performed.

Table 15

Group Ratings of Academic Regulation Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	17 (8%)	67 (31%)	95 (44%)	21 (10%)	16 (7%)
Students	40 (13%)	80 (25%)	121 (38%)	41 (13%)	35 (11%)
Counselors	6 (6%)	49 (47%)	40 (38%)	7 (7%)	3 (3%)

$x^2 = 20.24^{**}$
df = 6

The relatively large number of NP responses could be expected for some functions, such as academic regulation, since many students might not have the opportunity to be exposed to these activities as defined in the Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions. Other functions, however, are direct services to the student. A relatively large proportion of student NP responses would indicate that these services were not being utilized fully by students, or, at least, that these services were not advertised adequately to the student body.

The next four functions, student advisement, group orientation, student counseling, and career information, might be termed the core of the counseling services offered to two-year college students. "Student counseling," in particular, includes the dimensions most commonly defined as counseling activities. These four functions, with special emphasis on "student counseling," probably yield the best global evaluation of the performance of counseling activities found in the study.

All three groups were in close agreement in their evaluations of the student advisement function (Table 16), with about 70% of all responses in the fair or satisfactory categories. It is interesting to note that a considerable proportion of all groups rated the performance of student advisement as entirely inadequate. It is also notable that nearly one-fourth of all students indicated they did not know student advising was performed at their college. Surely whatever advising services were offered were not being fully utilized by students.

Table 16

Group Ratings of Student Advisement Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	23 (11%)	65 (39%)	87 (40%)	21 (10%)	20 (9%)
Students	49 (15%)	81 (26%)	90 (28%)	25 (8%)	72 (23%)
Counselors	13 (12%)	34 (32%)	47 (45%)	6 (6%)	5 (5%)

$x^2 = 9.49$
df = 6

Group orientation was rated considerably lower by counselors than by either students or faculty. About 20% of the counselors felt the performance of group orientation activities was entirely inadequate. Conversely, almost 20% of the students felt that group orientation activities were outstanding (Table 17). Faculty members tended to moderate their ratings, generally rating orientation as satisfactory. In this instance, at least, the professional was more critical of his own services than was the consumer.

Table 17

Group Ratings of Group Orientation Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	18 (8%)	62 (29%)	88 (41%)	17 (8%)	31 (14%)
Students	38 (12%)	75 (24%)	105 (33%)	57 (18%)	42 (13%)
Counselors	20 (19%)	34 (32%)	37 (35%)	8 (8%)	6 (6%)

$x^2 = 23.56^{**}$
df = 6

Counselors were in almost unanimous agreement that student counseling was performed at their colleges, while a full 25% of the students said they did not know of any counseling activities at their college (Table 18). There must be a lack of communication between students and counselors. Moreover, counselors rated the performance of student counseling very high, while students felt counseling was relatively poor. Faculty ratings were, again, between those of students and counselors. Perhaps the professional involvement of counselors in counseling activities tends to bias their opinions or their own activities. Or, it may be that students simply expect too much from counselors. In any case, a large discrepancy in the perception of student counseling was found between students and counselors. This area certainly warrants further investigation.

Table 18

Group Ratings of Student Counseling Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	12 (6%)	64 (30%)	89 (41%)	17 (8%)	34 (16%)
Students	49 (15%)	84 (27%)	82 (26%)	22 (7%)	80 (25%)
Counselors	9 (9%)	27 (26%)	49 (47%)	19 (18%)	1 (1%)

x^2 = 31.43**
df = 6

As shown in Table 19, counselors rated performance of the career information function less favorably than did faculty. Students seemed to be undecided about their ratings. Students, generally, might not be concerned about career decisions, resulting in indecision about the effectiveness of the career information function. If this is true, counselors may be correct in evaluating the function poorly. Two years is not much time for a student to gather enough meaningful data for an objective career decision. The large percentage of both student and faculty NP responses seems to indicate an apathetic orientation toward learning about career opportunities. It may be the counselor's role to create an awareness of the need for career information before an effective job of collecting and disseminating this information can be accomplished.

Table 19

Group Ratings of Career Information

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	17 (8%)	54 (25%)	79 (37%)	21 (10%)	45 (21%)
Students	40 (13%)	71 (22%)	80 (25%)	42 (13%)	84 (27%)
Counselors	21 (20%)	38 (36%)	88 (31%)	8 (8%)	5 (5%)

$x^2 = 17.15$**
df = 6

If student advisement, group orientation, student counseling, and career information are representative of counseling activities in two-year colleges, there was little agreement on the evaluation of these activities. Counselors appeared more defensive when the description of the activity related to their "professional identity." Thus, counselors rated student counseling fairly high while students rated it low. However, when the activity was not defined in terms of "professional counseling," but still was a counselor (or at least a guidance) responsibility, counselors were more critical of their performance than were the other two groups. The large proportion of students, and of faculty, responding to the "Not Performed" category of these basic counseling activities seems to indicate that counselors are failing to reach out on the campus with information about available services.

The financial aids function was evaluated positively by all three groups (Table 20). Students rated financial aids relatively lower than faculty or counselors, but overall the function seems to be performed satisfactorily.

Table 20

Group Ratings of Financial Aids Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	7 (3%)	25 (12%)	101 (47%)	47 (22%)	36 (17%)
Students	14 (4%)	52 (16%)	104 (33%)	91 (29%)	56 (18%)
Counselors	3 (3%)	15 (14%)	56 (53%)	27 (26%)	4 (4%)

$x^2 = 14.19$*
df = 6

Placement (Table 21), and student self-government (Table 22) were both evaluated similarly by all three groups. Most individuals felt placement was performed satisfactorily, while a larger proportion of respondents rated student self-government as poor or fair. The large proportion of students showing no knowledge of the placement function is probably due to a lack of contact with placement services until completion of a program of study. This figure, however, may reflect the lack of concern about career decisions noted earlier.

Table 21

Group Ratings of Placement Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	9 (4%)	51 (24%)	72 (33%)	38 (18%)	46 (21%)
Students	22 (7%)	44 (14%)	91 (29%)	47 (15%)	113 (36%)
Counselors	12 (11%)	26 (25%)	41 (39%)	18 (17%)	8 (8%)

$x^2 = 7.86$
df = 6

Table 22

Group Ratings of Student Self-Government Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	25 (12%)	67 (31%)	74 (34%)	16 (7%)	34 (16%)
Students	57 (18%)	74 (23%)	107 (34%)	28 (9%)	51 (16%)
Counselors	13 (12%)	30 (29%)	49 (47%)	10 (10%)	3 (3%)

$x^2 = 9.61$
df = 6

Administration of co-curricular activities was rated high by counselors and relatively lower by students (Table 23). It is difficult to interpret what this pattern might mean without probing into particular aspects of activities programs. It could be that well-planned, well-supervised programs do exist, and counselors rate them high. Students, though, may feel that the programs are poor for the very reasons counselors evaluate them highly. It seems evident, however, that existing activities do not satisfy students, expecially since 20% indicated no knowledge of such programs.

Table 23

Group Ratings of Co-Curricular Activities Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	20 (9%)	63 (29%)	82 (38%)	19 (9%)	32 (15%)
Students	46 (15%)	85 (27%)	94 (30%)	29 (9%)	63 (20%)
Counselors	6 (6%)	35 (33%)	44 (42%)	18 (17%)	2 (2%)

$x^2 = 14.21$*
df = 6

All groups tended to think the social regulation function was being performed satisfactorily (Table 24).

Table 24

Group Ratings of Social Regulation Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	18 (8%)	41 (19%)	110 (51%)	20 (9%)	27 (13%)
Students	33 (10%)	61 (19%)	126 (40%)	46 (15%)	51 (16%)
Counselors	5 (5%)	30 (29%)	54 (51%)	13 (12%)	3 (3%)

$x^2 = 12.20$
df = 6

Student induction activities were evidently not performed at many colleges, as indicated by a fairly large proportion of NP responses from all groups (Table 25). There may have been some difficulty in the interpretation of this function, however, since it was defined similarly to group orientation. The overall pattern of evaluations would indicate this, since each group responded in a similar manner to both functions. Counselors tended to evaluate induction activities as poor to fair, while faculty and students saw these activities as fair to satisfactory.

Table 25

Group Ratings of Student Induction Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	15 (7%)	64 (30%)	73 (34%)	15 (7%)	49 (23%)
Students	35 (11%)	86 (27%)	77 (24%)	36 (11%)	83 (26%)
Counselors	18 (17%)	33 (31%)	36 (34%)	7 (7%)	11 (10%)

$x^2 = 13.44$*
df = 6

Housing and health service functions were not classed as "basic" two-year college student personnel functions in the Raines (1965) study. Raines treated these functions as part of a special services unit which would tend to develop in larger, more mature student personnel programs. The two-year college consultants for this study urged that both housing and health functions be included as basic functions because these functions were presenting current problems.

As shown in Table 26, all three groups tended to feel that the health service function was performed satisfactorily. A large proportion of students and faculty, however, indicated that they were not familiar with any health services at their college. The extremely large proportion NP responses from all groups on the housing function shows that this function was not being performed at many colleges (Table 27). Of the individuals evaluating this function, students rated it slightly lower than either faculty or counselors. Perhaps students feel a need for more services in this area.

Table 26

Group Ratings of Health Service Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	18 (8%)	24 (11%)	91 (42%)	38 (18%)	45 (21%)
Students	27 (9%)	58 (18%)	103 (32%)	62 (20%)	67 (21%)
Counselors	6 (6%)	22 (21%)	45 (43%)	24 (23%)	8 (8%)

$x^2 = 9.78$
df = 6

Table 27

Group Ratings of Housing Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	16 (7%)	26 (12%)	65 (30%)	17 (8%)	92 (43%)
Students	29 (9%)	39 (12%)	70 (22%)	42 (13%)	137 (43%)
Counselors	14 (13%)	10 (10%)	37 (35%)	6 (6%)	38 (36%)

$x^2 = 14.49$*
df = 6

The remaining functions on the Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions were addressed only to counselors and faculty members. The nature of these functions was such that most students would be unfamiliar with them. The ratings of these functions by counselors and faculty are shown in Tables 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. Only one of these comparisons revealed a significant difference between the evaluations of counselors and faculty.

Table 28

Group Ratings of Applicant Appraisal Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	15 (7%)	40 (19%)	86 (40%)	21 (10%)	54 (25%)
Counselors	9 (9%)	21 (20%)	48 (46%)	9 (9%)	18 (17%)

$x^2 = 0.44$
df = 3

Table 29

Group Ratings of Educational Testing Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	22 (10%)	58 (27%)	68 (31%)	12 (6%)	56 (26%)
Counselors	24 (23%)	33 (31%)	31 (30%)	2 (2%)	15 (14%)

$x^2 = 9.03$
df = 3

Table 30

Group Ratings of Personnel Records Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	23 (11%)	63 (29%)	63 (29%)	7 (3%)	60 (28%)
Counselors	22 (21%)	43 (41%)	33 (31%)	2 (2%)	5 (5%)

$x^2 = 3.88$
df = 3

Table 31

Group Ratings of Program Articulation Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	29 (13%)	64 (30%)	62 (29%)	15 (7%)	46 (21%)
Counselors	16 (15%)	30 (29%)	45 (43%)	9 (9%)	5 (5%)

$x^2 = 2.26$
df = 3

Table 32

Group Ratings of In-Service Education Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	38 (18%)	62 (29%)	41 (19%)	14 (6%)	61 (28%)
Counselors	26 (25%)	31 (30%)	26 (25%)	6 (6%)	16 (15%)

$x^2 = 1.39$
df = 3

Table 33

Group Ratings of Program Evaluation Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	41 (19%)	60 (28%)	35 (16%)	13 (6%)	67 (31%)
Counselors	28 (27%)	32 (30%)	24 (23%)	5 (5%)	16 (15%)

$x^2 = 1.55$
df = 3

Table 34

Group Ratings of Administrative Organization Function

Group	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	NP
Faculty	20 (9%)	62 (29%)	69 (32%)	10 (5%)	55 (25%)
Counselors	22 (21%)	30 (29%)	37 (35%)	8 (8%)	8 (8%)

$x^2 = 5.58$
df = 3

Educational testing was rated somewhat lower by counselors than by faculty (Table 29). The performances of the personnel records, in-service education, program evaluation, and administrative organization functions were all rated extremely low. The position of these items, toward the end of Part I of the questionnaire, may have had an effect on responses. It is doubtful, however, that a position-bias could account entirely for the poor evaluations of these functions. These functions could all be characterized as administrative and/or developmental. If the evaluations of the functions are accurate, it would be correct to conclude that student personnel organizations are probably not administered with dynamic leadership. Nor are they emphasizing self-evaluation and self-correction with concurrent efforts to change the organization and services to meet immediate or future needs of the institution.

Summary

It is evident from an examination of the NP responses to all functions that overall there is quite a gap between the student personnel functions counselors say are offered and the student personnel functions students and faculty think are offered. Whether this is actually a credibility gap, or simply implies the need for better educative functions by student personnel workers is not answerable from the results of this study. The relationship between knowledge of services available and use of those services should be a fruitful area for future research.

Of the 16 student personnel functions evaluated by faculty, students, and counselors, there was statistically significant disagreement between the evaluations of the three groups on nine functions. Generally, the widest variation was between students and counselors. Faculty members were usually more nearly in agreement with counselors than with students. The similarity of faculty and counselor ratings was illustrated by the ratings of the final seven items, where only one function was evaluated differently by the two groups.

These findings suggest that the design and evaluation of student personnel services in two-year colleges should take the viewpoint of students into consideration. There is no way to determine which group correctly evaluated a function when evaluations differed, and it may be that criteria of performance can only be established from a personal or group frame of reference. Nevertheless, services which reflect only the professional's point of view may be ineffective or even irrelevant to what students really need.

Part II: Relative Frequency of Student Problems

It was hypothesized that faculty, students and counselors might have different perceptions of the occurrence of student problems. If this were true, there could be discrepancies in the types of counseling services needed and the types of services actually offered by counselors.

The mean rating for each type of student problem by respondent group is shown in Table 35. Subjects were instructed to rank seven kinds of student problems from the most common (1) in their college to the least common (7) in their college.

Mean ranks of problems were nearly the same for all three groups. The numbers in parentheses in Table 35 show the rank of each item in terms of the mean for each group. It was expected that mixed or combination problems category would be rated first, and it was by counselors. Scholastic-adjustment problems, however, were ranked highest by faculty and students,

Table 35

Mean Rank of Frequency of
Student Problems by Groups

Problem	Group Mean Faculty	 Students	 Counselors
Educational-Planning	3.787 (3)	3.254 (3)	3.400 (3)
Financial	4.388 (6)	3.895 (5)	4.714 (6)
Health	6.458 (7)	6.329 (7)	6.810 (7)
Mixed or Combination	2.843 (2)	3.092 (2)	2.229 (1)
Scholastic-Adjustment	2.035 (1)	2.751 (1)	2.600 (2)
Social-Emotional	4.332 (5)	4.674 (6)	4.086 (5)
Vocational	4.064 (4)	3.879 (4)	4.029 (4)

with mixed problems next. Scholastic adjustment problems were perceived as second most frequent by counselors.

All groups rated education planning problems third and vocational problems fourth in frequency of occurrence. Students saw financial problems fifth most frequent, and social-emotional problems sixth. Faculty and counselors reversed the importance of these problems. There was strong agreement that health problems are the least common among two-year college students.

To the extent that these rankings, supported by general agreement among groups, reflect the actual occurrence of student problems, the priorities of need for specific student personnel services can be implied from the assigned ranks.

Part III: Attitude Toward Counseling and Counseling Services

Part III included six opinion items designed to measure general opinions toward counseling. The items and alternative responses are shown in Appendix A. It was felt that opinions toward counseling would reflect the affective evaluation of counseling and counselors, which might be different than the Part I evaluations of the performance of specific student personnel functions including counseling. Moreover, opinions toward counseling might indicate (1) the extent to which students would use counseling services, and (2) the extent of support counselors might expect from the faculty.

Responses to Item 1 are shown in Table 36. Students and faculty were in agreement that professional guidance and counseling services are important to many students, with a majority responding that these services are essential. Counselors, as expected, felt that professional services are essential.

Table 36

Opinion About Special Guidance and Counseling Services for Two-Year College Students

Group	Opinion				
	Unnecessary	Minimum	Important	Essential	Total
Faculty	1 (0.5%)	11 (5%)	76 (36%)	125 (59%)	213
Students	4 (1%)	5 (2%)	119 (39%)	181 (59%)	309
Counselors	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	27 (26%)	76 (73%)	104
					626

x^2 = 15.75**
df = 6

Counselors were in almost unanimous agreement that the functions of the counseling staff should not be taken over by the faculty (Table 37). Almost one-quarter of the faculty and an unexpected 37% of students felt that the faculty should assume counseling activities. It might be that the students with unfavorable opinions were sensitive to the group differences in ranking the most important student problems (Table 35). Students and faculty both clearly perceived scholastic-adjustment problems as the most frequent among two-year college students. Counselors, however, saw mixed or combination problems which include scholastic-adjustment problems as well as social-emotional, health, financial, or other combinations as the most important. Students may find that faculty members are more apt to deal with the actual problem, scholastic, while counselors tend to deal with "psychological causes" of problems.

Table 37

Should Functions of the Counseling Staff
by Assumed by the Faculty?

Group	Opinion		
	Yes	No	Total
Faculty	51 (24%)	159 (76%)	210
Students	114 (37%)	192 (63%)	306
Counselors	4 (4%)	100 (96%)	104
			620

x^2 = 66.02**
df = 2

About three-fourths of both counselors and faculty felt that counselors and the teaching faculty are equally well qualified for their respective jobs (Table 38), with a higher proportion of counselors than faculty saying that counselors are better qualified. One-fourth of the students, counselors' severest critics, felt that counselors are not as well qualified as the teaching faculty.

Table 38

Comparison of the Competence of
Counselors and Faculty

Group	Counselors are:			
	Not as Well Prepared	About as Well Prepared	Better Qualified	Total
Faculty	30 (15%)	151 (76%)	17 (9%)	198
Students	77 (26%)	178 (61%)	39 (13%)	294
Counselors	6 (6%)	74 (73%)	22 (22%)	102
				594

x^2 = 32.12**
df = 4

The counselors' perceptual bias was particularly evident when asked how students feel about going to see a counselor (Table 39). Only 24% of the counselors said that students do not feel free to see a counselor or do not know a counseling service is available. In contrast, 60% of the students and 50% of the faculty felt that many students would not see a counselor. A discrepancy of this size in the perception of student feelings must have an influence on both the services offered by counselors and the use of these services by students.

Table 39

How do Students Feel About Going to a Counselor?

Group	Opinion				
	Most do not Know About	Many do not Feel Free	Most Feel Free	All Feel Free	Total
Faculty	22 (11%)	77 (39%)	85 (43%)	16 (8%)	200
Students	46 (15%)	137 (45%)	84 (28%)	36 (12%)	303
Counselors	9 (9%)	15 (15%)	69 (67%)	10 (10%)	103
					606

x^2 - 55.12 **
df = 6

The bias of counselors was again noted when asked how much help students feel they have received from a counselor. Almost 40% of the counselors thought students generally feel that they have received a lot of help from a counselor (Table 40), while only about 20% of students and faculty responded similarly.

Inspite of some disagreement with the counselors over the efficacy of their services, students and faculty did not feel that counseling services should be reduced (Table 41). However, counselors once more seemed to over-evaluate the need for their services, with almost 90% responding that counseling services should be increased contrasted to only about two-thirds

Table 40

Amount of Help Students Feel They Receive

Group	Students Feel They Received:			
	No Help	Some Help	A Lot of Help	Total
Faculty	6 (3%)	154 (79%)	34 (18%)	194
Students	19 (6%)	215 (72%)	65 (22%)	299
Counselors	0 (0%)	65 (63%)	38 (37%)	103
				596

x^2 = 22.11**
df = 4

Table 41

Amount of Professional Counseling Services

Group	Services Should be:			
	Reduced	Kept be Same	Increased	Total
Faculty	4 (2%)	64 (31%)	138 (67%)	206
Students	1 (0%)	101 (33%)	204 (67%)	306
Counselors	3 (3%)	11 (10%)	93 (87%)	107
				619

x^2 = 25.02**
df = 4

of faculty and students in this category. Even though there was this discrepancy, it should be noted that an overall two-thirds vote for increasing counseling services expresses quite a strong sentiment from the consuming public.

Summary. Overall, the opinions expressed about counseling by all three respondent groups were very favorable. There were significant differences in manner of responding between the groups on all opinion items. Counselors made the most positive evaluation of counseling and counselors in all cases. Students generally were the most negative. It appeared that counselors had a "perceptual bias" to view their services as more important and successful than did other groups. This bias could possibly lead to an unrealistic administration and evaluation of counseling at any given college.

Faculty and Student Response Patterns

The characteristics of the student and faculty samples responding to the questionnaire are described in Appendix C. The student sample was comprised of a majority of full-time students, probably due to the difficulty campus coordinators had in contacting evening or part-time students. About equal numbers of students indicated that they were in technical-occupational and general-transfer majors. However, 74% of these students intended to transfer to a four-year college. Almost three-fourths of the students lived at home. A large proportion had seen a counselor for personal counseling and/or testing.

A note of the faculty sample is appropriate at this point also. Generally, the sample conforms to the expected pattern of characteristics. There was, again, a smaller percentage of return from evening and part-time instructors. The surprising result, however, was the amount of teaching experience of the responding faculty. Less than half of the faculty had more than three years experience at their present college, but 73% indicated that they had more than three years total teaching experience. It would be interesting to investigate the career patterns of two-year college faculty members.

Responses to the Appraisal of Student Personnel Functions and to the Attitude items were cross tabulated for all of the Personal Data Sheet characteristics. This analysis was conducted to examine the general form of responses with the hope that some characteristics affecting evaluations of student personnel services might be identified.

Only those characteristics which consistently differentiated responses will be discussed, since the large number of comparisons conducted tended to increase the probability of finding a statistically significant relationship between variables. In addition, it often happened that one or more categories of a characteristic included only a very small proportion of the total sample, resulting in serious questions about the representativeness of the responses of those individuals. For instance, when student status, full-time, part-time, or evening, was considered, only ten students were in the part-time category. The responses of these ten students could hardly be taken as representative of all part-time students in New York two-year colleges.

Student status, however, was one characteristic which consistently differentiated students. Almost without exception, evening students evaluated the performance of student personnel functions much lower than did full-time students. In addition, the proportion of evening students indicating that they did not know a function was performed was consistently larger than the proportion of full-time students. On the attitude items, evening students were more often in favor of increased counseling services, and a majority indicated that the faculty should replace counselors. It seems quite evident that evening students feel they are not receiving the benefit of available student personnel services.

Whether a student was in his first or second year of college had little effect on responses except on the placement function. About 70% of the first year students did not know about the performance of a placement function. Only 34%, still a sizable proportion, of second-year students checked NP in regard to placement. Contiguity to a decision point seems to effect familiarity with sources of data about that decision.

It might be hypothesized that need for information motivates seeking behavior. Several differences in attitude which were found tend to support this hypothesis. Students in a technical-occupational major generally felt that counseling services are important to many students who have problems serious enough to interfere with college work. Those students in a general-transfer curriculum, however, endorsed the statement that counseling services are essential to get the maximum benefit from college. Likewise, technical-occupational students were about evenly split in opinion over the issue of the faculty assuming the functions of the counseling staff. General-transfer students emphatically said that the faculty should not assume counseling functions. It might be surmised that technical-occupational students can get needed information from faculty members, but transfer students have to rely on counselors for data pertaining to ability, choice of four-year institution, and other transfer concerns.

Similar differences were noted between students indicating that they were or were not planning to transfer to a four-year college. About two-thirds of the students planning to transfer felt that the faculty should not assume counseling functions. Non-transfer students were about evenly split on this item. The other item differentiating transfer and non-transfer students dealt with counselor competence. Students intending to transfer said counselors are about as well prepared as the teaching faculty. Almost one-third of the non-transfer students felt counselors were not as well prepared as the faculty. Perhaps counselors are not as well prepared to furnish information relevant to decisions of non-transfer student as are the faculty in occupational areas.

This evidence illustrates a need for a study of decision-information dimensions and sources in the two-year college setting.

Place of residence also consistently differentiated the responses of students. Generally, students who indicated that they lived at home were much less well-informed about student personnel services and tended to evaluate the ones with which they were familiar lower than did students who lived away from home. Again, it seemed that students living at home simply did not have a "need to know" about many student personnel services. Examples of functions with a large proportion of NP responses from students living at home were: precollege information, group orientation, career information, student self-government, co-curricular activities, health service, and housing. Attending college while living at home appears to be a work-week, eight-hour-per-day concern. It would be interesting to compare the outcomes of the two-year college experience between students who live at home and those who live away from home during the educational experience. It could be hypothesized that living away from home would contribute more to the development of the student.

Other trends in responses which were found could generally be expected. One trend, though, could be significant. Students who have utilized counseling services evaluate the performance of student personnel functions more positively and have more positive attitudes toward counseling than students who have not utilized counseling services. This response pattern has implications about the effects of counseling quite different than if the pattern had been more counseling, then more negative evaluations. Exposure to counseling in some form at least seems to lead to favorable attitudinal changes.

It was found that the longer students stay in college, the more likely they are to have seen a counselor. Likewise, full-time students were much more likely to have seen a counselor than were evening students. Unexpectedly, it was found that a larger proportion of technical-occupational major students lived away from home than did general-transfer major students. Perhaps technical programs, being more specialized, are not as readily available in one's own community as a general-transfer curriculum.

None of the faculty personal characteristics consistently differentiated response patterns. The characteristic which most often was related to type of response was total teaching experience. Those individuals with ten or more years of experience tended to evaluate the performance of student personnel functions lower than did individuals with less experience. Likewise, instructors with less than three years of experience were more likely to have no knowledge of the performance of student personnel functions.

Inventory of Counseling Services

The Inventory of Counseling Services was administered to counselors to obtain their evaluation of 22 specific counseling activities and an estimate of the extent to which these activities were being performed in two-year colleges. A summary of responses to each item is presented in Table 42.

Table 42

Summary of Responses to the
Inventory of Counseling Services (N=111)

1. Interpretation of standardized admission tests to beginning students to assist in planning their academic programs.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	41 (37%)	16 (14%)	25 (23%)	24 (22%)	5 (5%)

2. Administration and interpretation of diagnostic tests for basic scholastic skills. such as reading, writing, and mathematics.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	23 (21%)	23 (21%)	30 (27%)	30 (27%)	5 (5%)

(Table 42 cont.)

3. Administration and interpretation of interest tests.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	25 (23%)	11 (10%)	24 (22%)	43 (39%)	8 (7%)

4. Use of tests for special vocational skills, such as mechanical aptitude or dexterity tests.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	63 (57%)	14 (13%)	19 (17%)	13 (12%)	2 (2%)

5. Conducting special studies for the purpose of improving services to students, to the faculty, or to the college.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	28 (25%)	26 (23%)	28 (25%)	28 (25%)	1 (1%)

6. Administration and interpretation of general ability or intelligence tests.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	39 (35%)	13 (12%)	23 (21%)	29 (26%)	7 (6%)

7. Administration and interpretation of personality tests.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	47 (42%)	18 (16%)	17 (15%)	26 (23%)	3 (3%)

8. Explanation of admission requirements and furnishing information about the college to individuals or groups.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	11 (10%)	11 (10%)	11 (10%)	57 (51%)	21 (19%)

9. Orientation to the campus and to college life.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	6 (5%)	12 (11%)	29 (26%)	50 (45%)	14 (13%)

(Table 42 cont.)

10. Interpretation of course and scholastic requirements for particular academic programs.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	11 (10%)	7 (6%)	33 (30%)	59 (45%)	10 (9%)

11. Help with course selection for students transferring to a four-year institution.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	13 (12%)	9 (8%)	19 (17%)	54 (49%)	16 (14%)

12. Instruction in study skills, either with groups or individual students.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	14 (13%)	25 (23%)	35 (32%)	24 (22%)	13 (12%)

13. Interpretation of skills and special abilities needed for particular occupations.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	18 (16%)	14 (13%)	38 (34%)	34 (31%)	7 (6%)

14. Providing occupational information such as books, pamphlets, statistics, and the local and national employment outlook.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	10 (9%)	16 (14%)	31 (28%)	39 (35%)	15 (14%)

15. Help with personal--social--emotional problems.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	6 (5%)	1 (1%)	15 (14%)	70 (63%)	19 (17%)

16. Clarification of values, attitudes, personal goals, etc.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	11 (10%)	4 (4%)	26 (23%)	55 (50%)	15 (14%)

(Table 42 cont.)

17. Assisting students with financial problems to find grants, part-time jobs, or loans, and to properly manage their finances.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	7 (6%)	2 (25%)	12 (11%)	63 (57%)	27 (24%)

18. Referral for remedial help with basic scholastic skills.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	8 (7%)	17 (15%)	44 (40%)	32 (29%)	10 (9%)

19. Liaison with both high schools and four-year colleges so students interested in transferring will have the necessary information to plan for program requirements.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	11 (10%)	15 (14%)	23 (21%)	46 (41%)	16 (14%)

20. Liaison with local business and industry employment representatives and state employment service.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	11 (10%)	14 (13%)	32 (29%)	41 (37%)	13 (12%)

21. Utilizing the services of a mental health clinic or other professional services for more severe personal problems.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	13 (12%)	14 (13%)	22 (20%)	43 (39%)	19 (17%)

22. Use of a psychometrist for intensive testing.

	NP	1	2	3	4
Frequency:	80 (72%)	10 (9%)	6 (5%)	11 (10%)	4 (4%)

There was a detectable pattern in the activities which a large proportion of counselors said were not performed on their campuses. Generally, the appraisal functions, involving administration and interpretation of different types of testing instruments, including the employment of a psychometrist, were reported to be not performed at a large number of colleges. It also appeared that a large number of student personnel staffs fail to appraise themselves by conducting studies of their services.

The activities which were evaluated as most poorly performed were, again, most of the appraisal or testing items, including institutional studies and the interpretation of skills for particular occupations. Instruction in study skills and referral for help with study skills were also evaluated as poorly performed.

Educational advising activities, such as help with course selection for transfer to a four-year college, explanation of admission requirements, and interpretation of course and scholastic requirements, were generally said to be well performed. Other well-evaluated activities (not necessarily "counseling" in nature) were financial aids and orientation. The most highly evaluated activities were those describing a person-to-person counseling situation: clarification of goals and values, and particularly, help with personal social-emotional problems. When the previously noted bias in counselors' perceptions of their own professional activity is considered, it is questionable whether the counselor is really as effective in dealing with "personal" problems as he claims he is.

Description of the Two-Year College Counselor

The Inventory of Staff Resources (Appendix D) yielded a rather comprehensive description of the typical counselor employed in a New York State two-year college. He is a mobile (about two and one-half years per job), well-educated (mean of 48 graduate hours) individual who spends about 73% of his work time in counseling activities and probably came to his present position from a high school teaching or counseling background.

Counselors seem to change positions frequently and to have relatively little experience in their present position (mean number of years, 2.26). Career routes to counseling positions in two-year colleges were varied. However, a large number of counselors reported that their last position and/or the position prior to that one was in a high school. The second most frequent route to the counselors' position appears to be from four-year college student personnel work. Few counselors appear to have had extensive experience in two-year colleges, either in counseling (mean years in two-year college student personnel work, 2.98), teaching (mean years, 0.92), or administration (mean years, 0.20). Conversely, hardly any of the counselors in the study were recently in graduate school. The two positions prior to the counselors' present position are examined in Table 43.

Table 43

Career Patterns of Two-Year College Counselors

Type of Position	Frequency of Second Most Recent Position	Frequency of Third Most Recent Position
High School Teacher	15	21
High School Counselor	15	17
Two-Year College Student Personnel	17	3
Two-Year College Instructor	2	0
Four-Year College Student Personnel	14	9
Four-Year College Instructor	1	2
Business-Industry	2	5
Graduate Student	6	2
Government	0	0
Other	39	52
Mean Years in Position	2.58	2.68

Only seven of the counselors responding were in a part-time position. The average amount of work time spent in self-defined counseling activities was 73.5%. Of 100 individuals repsonding to item 13, 90 classified themselves as professional student personnel workers, six felt they were not professional student personnel workers, and four were unsure. These data imply a strong professional identification among counselors and indicate that professional time is being well, but not fully, utilized.

Quite extensive information about length of experience in different educational settings was collected. To conserve space, not all of this information will be reviewed. Little experience in administration at any level was represented in the sample. The largest average number of years of experience resulted from employment in student personnel work in two-year colleges. Elementary-secondary school teaching, however, was the position representing the second largest number of years of experience, with elementary-secondary student personnel work third. If the instrument had been more precise, most of this experience would probably have been identified at the secondary level. The average number of years in educational work of all types for all counselors was 8.08.

It appears that counselors often become interested in educational and counseling concerns as college undergraduates. This is true if the kinds of course-work taken is an indication of interest. Counselors reported means of 13 semester credits in education, 12 semester credits in psychology, and 21 semester credits in other social sciences. Undergraduate programs including this pattern of courses should well prepare future counselors for graduate work.

The masters degree was the most common level of academic preparation. The counselor sample included 10 doctorates, 79 masters, and 13 bachelors degrees, representing an average of 47.75 graduate semester credits. The most common graduate preparation for counselors was a major in counseling and guidance (Table 44). It was often difficult to separate individuals reporting a graduate major in educational counseling and guidance, probably designed for secondary school guidance personnel, from those reporting a counseling psychology major. The classification system utilized, however, was probably accurate. Both the type of degree and name of the major were criteria of classification.

Table 44

Graduate Majors of Counselors

Major	Frequency
Sociology	1
Psychology	5
Student Personnel	32
Education	6
Counseling and Guidance	51
Other	5

About two-thirds of the counselors reported a supervised practicum experience during their graduate program, with an average of 4.15 semester credits. The typical practicum setting was in a four-year college or university (N=36), with secondary schools the next most frequent (N=19). Few counselors had experienced a supervised practicum in a two-year college (N=6) before they were hired. The practicum experience most often emphasized supervised counseling (N=45). Six individuals reported a practicum devoted about equally to counseling and other student personnel services. Student personnel services other than counseling comprised 16 of the practicum experiences reported. An investigation of the effects of the setting and primary emphasis of the practicum experience on counseling skills would be appropriate. Is a counselor more effective if his graduate training includes a practicum experience similar in significant dimensions to the position he will hold following graduation? What are these "significant dimensions?"

Each counselor was asked to indicate if he had taken graduate courses in selected areas. No measurement of the amount of work in an area was attempted. It was hoped that an estimate of the types of experiences comprising counselor training programs could be obtained by the checklist procedure. The frequency of selected subjects in graduate work is presented in Table 45.

Table 45

Distribution of Graduate Course Work (N=111)

Subject Area	Number (Percentage) of Counselors Who had a Course
Counseling Interview	92 (83%)
Clinical Testing	43 (39%)
Educational Testing	86 (77%)
Group Guidance (includes group dynamics)	75 (68%)
Occupational Information	74 (67%)
Research Methodology (includes statistics, theses)	80 (72%)
Other Student Personnel and Guidance	51 (46%)
Occupational Education	38 (34%)
Higher Education	53 (48%)
Other Education	47 (42%)
Cognate Courses (psychology, sociology, anthropology)	86 (77%)

It can be seen that counselor training programs are varied. Most of the counselors (83%) had a course of some type in interviewing, in educational testing (77%), and in a cognate area (77%). Other than these areas, there was not much in common in the graduate education of counselors included in this study.

Moreover, there appears to be little effort expended by the two-year colleges to provide any training for counselors after they are hired. If it could be assumed that the typical counselor is a qualified professional possessing all the skills necessary for any duty he may be assigned, then there might be a justification for little in-service training. The results of this study, however, make this assumption indefensible. It seems that the individual college should assume some responsibility for training an individual for the specific requirements of a particular position. Only 19% of the counselors had any on-the-job training in any two-year college where they have been employed.

Item 30 of the Inventory asked for an evaluation of graduate experiences. Part one asked "In relationship to your current job assignment--What were the most significant graduate experiences or courses?" Responses were (in descending order of the number of times listed):

Testing courses (all types, generally indicating applied testing)	33
Practicum or intern experience	31
Counseling theory courses	24
Counseling techniques courses	23
Psychology courses	14
Research methods and statistics courses	13
Group dynamics courses, sensitivity training	13
Administration courses, including higher education and student personnel	9

Occupational information courses	8
Sociology courses	5
Guidance courses	3
Personal contact with professors	2

Part two of item 30 asked "What were the least helpful graduate experiences or courses?" Fewer individuals responded to this questions, and some of the responses were the same as experiences mentioned as most significant. The design of a particular learning experience and the nature of the current job assignment should be considered in these ambivalent cases. Responses were (again in descending order of requency):

Occupational-vocational information courses	25
General education courses	14
Research methods and statistics courses	9
Administration courses, including student personnel	9
Philosophy of education	8
Tests and measurements	8
Guidance courses	6
Group dynamics, Sociology, Practicium	1 each

Several counselors mentioned graduate education in the "comments" section also. A few of the more common comments are summarized below:

> "more course work on the community college and in group dynamics (sensitivity training)."
>
> "many initial anxieties would have been lessened if I had had more counseling experience and a supervised practicum."
>
> "need a good training program in psychotherapy, and a good supervised counseling practicum. More doctoral programs for counseling and clinical psychology should be established in the New York City area."
>
> "would like a decent supervised practicum."
>
> "counselor training is completely lacking in group dynamics (group counseling and sensitivity training). I have had to learn this on my own."

> "I am appalled at your use of the term 'college guidance counselor' and reject it. If that is all one is in the two-year college we are really missing the boat."

> "more specific information about junior colleges and junior college students."

> "greater depth in personality assessment and knowledge of measurement instruments."

> "can't find anyone trained to work in placement."

> "need to get away from graduate programs designed to meet certification requirements. Add more advanced psychology and personality courses. Need to be familiar with computers."

> "Schools of education should be abolished . . . Sociology, history, and literature provide a much finer basis for working with people."

> "Should definitely contain some form of sensitivity training."

These comments really require no further comment.

The last part of the Inventory of Staff Resources dealt with how the counselor spends his working time. Estimates of the percentage of total work time spent in each of eight types of functions were requested. Although self-reports of time in particular duties may be unreliable, this approach was utilized because it was feasible and because only an estimate was required.

Counselors do seem to devote the largest proportion of their working time to consultation functions (a mean of 34.44% was reported). But, approximately two-thirds of their work time was taken up by other activities. These activities with their respective mean estimated percentages of time are: Service functions, 11.52%; Orientation functions, 10.26%; Organizational functions, 9.49%; Appraisal functions, 7.92%; Participation functions, 5.35%; Regulation functions, 5.31%; and other functions, 5.26%.

The question must be raised whether counselors are utilizing their particular expertise to the best advantage. Tangential to this question, of course, is whether the two-year college counselor should be a counseling specialist or a student personnel generalist. Can professional student personnel activities in a two-year college be organized such that the professional staff can all be specialists? This would be a fruitful research area with implications for both the practice of student personnel and the graduate training of professionals.

Finally, counselors were asked at which group of students counseling activities were directed. As expected, full-time students received the most attention. It was estimated that an average of 75% of the time spent in counseling activities was devoted to full-time students. Part-time students (less than 10% of the total enrollment) were the focus of approximately 13% of the counseling effort. And evening students (almost 50% of the total enrollment) received 10% of the total professional time in counseling.

Counselors' Recommendations for Improving Two-Year College Counseling

Personal comments about counseling services in their own colleges were solicited from counselors. Many of the suggestions for the improvement of counseling services were quite relevant in view of the information gathered in the present study. Some of these suggestions were:

> More research and meaningful data on counseling, even at an elementary level, is sorely needed.
>
> There is a crucial need to distinguish between therapy and "helping" as counseling activities. Then, counseling objectives should be established for each institution which best further institutional objectives.
>
> All types of testing should be expanded, with a concomitant increase in the interpretation of test results as a form of counseling relationship.
>
> In-service training should be increased.

The training of future counselors should emphasize psychology rather than education.

Study skills specialists must be hired.

Counseling activities must be administered effectively within a responsive organizational pattern. Administrators of student personnel services should be competent professionals capable of creative organizational leadership.

References

Gleazer, E. J. (Ed.) American Junior Colleges. (7th ed.) Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Raines, M. R. (Ed.) Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

College____________________

Part I

APPRAISAL OF STUDENT PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

Listed below are several functions which could be classified as "student personnel" functions. Utilizing the following scale, please circle the appropriate number following each function which most nearly indicates your own opinion of how well each function is performed at your college.

NP Not Performed, or I have absolutely no knowledge of the performance of this function.

1. Poor. Function is performed, but is entirely inadequate.
2. Fair. Function is performed, but the quality and/or quantity of services does not meet the needs of the college or students.
3. Satisfactory. Function is performed in an acceptable manner, with room for improvement in quality or broadening of application.
4. Outstanding. Function is performed in an excellent manner. Difficult to improve either and quality or quantity of services.

For example, under "Precollege Information" you may think that the handling of inquiries concerning college attendance is handled well, but there should be many more activities added under this function. You would probably circle "2" for this function.

Note that the illustrative tasks for each function are only a few examples of the activities included in that function. You may be able to think of many more tasks which would be included in any function.

Please rate every function and circle only one number or NP for each function.

Function	Illustrations of Some Typical Tasks	
1. Precollege Information	Conferring with high school groups; preparing and distributing descriptive material; handling of inquiries concerning college attendance; offering advisory talks to parents.	NP 1 2 3 4
2. Applicant Consulting	Interpreting test results to applicants; explaining curricular requirements; assisting students in selecting courses; introducing career planning.	NP 1 2 3 4

3.	Student Registration	Designing procedures and necessary forms; processing class changes and withdrawals; projecting college and class enrollments.	NP 1 2 3 4
4.	Academic Regulation	Interpreting requirements to students; advising faculty and administration on academic policies; evaluating graduation eligibility; presenting pertinent information in questions of probation and disqualification.	NP 1 2 3 4
5.	Student Advisement	Scheduling advisees into classes; reviewing senior college requirements; advising students on special study skills needed.	NP 1 2 3 4
6.	Group Orientation	Conducting orientation classes; introducing students to all aspects of college life; presenting occupational information; teaching effective study skills.	NP 1 2 3 4
7.	Student Counseling	Conducting counseling interviews; acting as catalyst in student evaluation of values; administering and interpreting diagnostic tests; making appropriate referrals; providing a special program of health counseling.	NP 1 2 3 4
8.	Career Information	Studying manpower needs within the community and region; indentifying sources of occupational information; developing effective methods for disseminating career information.	NP 1 2 3 4
9.	Financial Aids	Analyzing financial needs of students; seeking funds for grants-in-aid; administering student loans; arranging for part-time employment.	NP 1 2 3 4
10.	Placement	Arranging placement interviews for graduates and dropouts maintaining liaison with employment sources; conducting follow-up studies.	NP 1 2 3 4
11.	Student Self-Government	Advising student government; increasing the involvement of students in the college decision-making process; conducting leadership programs or classes; supervising elections and student conferences.	NP 1 2 3 4

12.	Co-Curricular Activities	Assisting students in the planning of a varied activities program; encouraging student involvement in significant projects; supervising student activities; helping in budget preparation; evaluating the worth of various activities.	NP 1 2 3 4
13.	Social Regulation	Working with administration and students in developing policies covering all social activities; maintaining a social calendar; arranging for facilities; handling cases of social misconduct.	NP 1 2 3 4
14.	Student Induction	Training returning students to help new students; introducing students to college activities; interpreting student services and regulations.	NP 1 2 3 4
15.	Health Service	Availability of, or referral to a physician; personal health counseling; providing first aid treatment.	NP 1 2 3 4
16.	Housing	Maintaining a list of approved off-campus housing; conducting inspections of housing; facilitating student-landlord communications.	NP 1 2 3 4
17.	Applicant Appraisal	Evaluating transcripts of previous academic work; serving on admissions committee.	NP 1 2 3 4
18.	Educational Testing	Selecting and developing appropriate testing instruments; administering tests to incoming students; developing normative and predictive data.	NP 1 2 3 4
19.	Personnel Records	Developing a meaningful and integrated records system; establishing and implementing policies regarding record accessibility; conducting and interpreting research on student characteristics.	NP 1 2 3 4
20.	Program Articulation	Arranging for staff liaison with high school counselors and with appropriate officials at colleges of transfer; appointing student personnel staff members to faculty committees; arranging for close communication with various academic departments.	NP 1 2 3 4

21.	In-Service Education	Providing for staff supervision; encouraging staff participation in professional associations; arranging for consultants to the staff; organizing a systematic program of in-service training for both the professional and the clerical staff.	NP 1 2 3 4
22.	Program Evaluation	Developing experimental projects; conducting local institutional research; cooperating in regional, statewide and national research projects; arranging for follow-up studies of former students.	NP 1 2 3 4
23.	Administrative Organization	Providing administrative leadership to all facets of the student personnel program; preparing organizational patterns and job descriptions; preparing budgetary requests; identifying and interpreting staffing needs.	NP 1 2 3 4

Part II

RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF STUDENT PROBLEMS

Below are given seven kinds of student problems, arranged alphabetically. Which one of these, in your judgement, is the most common or frequent in your college? Indicate your answer by writing a "1" on the space provided to the right of the heading. Now, which one is the next most common? Answer by placing a "2" on the line to the right of the appropriate heading. Continue in this way until you have used numbers 1 through 7, with "7" indicating the least common type of problem.

Rank

(1) Educational-planning problems.................................. ________

such as electing courses, choosing co-curricular activities, selecting a transfer college, etc.

(2) Financial problems.. ________

such as insufficient funds, too much outside work to allow time for study, inefficient budgeting, etc.

(3) Health problems... ________

such as general poor health, specific illnesses, severe physical handicap, etc.

(4) Mixed or Combination problems................................. ________

such as a combination of social-emotional and scholastic adjustment problems, a mixture of educational, health, and financial problems, or any other combination.

(5) Scholastic-adjustment problems................................ ________

such as academic failure, poor study habits, dissatisfaction with courses, underachievement, etc.

(6) Social-emotional problems...................................... ________

such as lack of social skills, personality difficulties, religious or moral conflicts, etc.

(7) Vocational problems.. ________

such as vocational indecision, conflict with parents about vocational goal, interest-aptitude discrepancy, etc.

Part III

ATTITUDE TOWARD COUNSELING AND COUNSELING SERVICES

1. What is your opinion about providing special guidance and counseling services (i.e., personal interviews, special testing, vocational advising, etc., by a professionally trained counselor) for students in two-year colleges? Please circle one number.

    (1) These services are unnecessary as long as adequate information about vocations and academic requirements is available from other sources or off-campus agencies.

    (2) Counseling services seem necessary for a few students, but these services should be kept to a minimum.

    (3) Counseling services are important to many students who seem to have academic, vocational, or personal problems serious enough to interfere with college work.

    (4) Counseling services are essential if all students are to get the maximum benefit from their college experience.

2. Should the functions of the professional counseling staff at this college be assumed by the teaching faculty, with appropriate adjustment of teaching load and adequate clerical help? Please circle one number.

    (1) Yes

    (2) No

3. How would you compare the competence of the college's counseling personnel with that of the teaching faculty? Please circle one number.

    (1) On the whole, the counselors are not as well prepared for their job as the teaching faculty are for theirs.

    (2) The counselors are about as well qualified for their job as the faculty are for theirs.

    (3) The counselors are generally better qualified for their job than the teaching faculty are for theirs.

4. How do students at your college feel about going to see a counselor? Please circle one number.

    (1) Most students simply do not know a counseling services is available.
    (2) Many students do not feel free to go see a counselor.
    (3) Most students feel free to go to a counselor.
    (4) Nearly all students feel free to see a counselor.

5. Do the students who have seen a counselor at your college generally feel they have received: Please circle one.

   (1) No help?

   (2) Some help?

   (3) A lot of help?

6. The professional counseling services offered students at your college should be: Please circle one.

   (1) Reduced.

   (2) Maintained about as now offered..

   (3) Increased.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Please put the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return to the Dean of Students Office or to the person who forwarded it to you.

Appendix B

Inventory of Counseling Services

INVENTORY OF COUNSELING SERVICES

Listed below are a series of services which might be offered by a college guidance counselor.

Utilizing the following scale, please circle one number or NP at the right of each service to indicate your own opinion of how well each service is performed at your college.

NP Not Performed

1. Poor. Service is performed, but is entirely inadequate.
2. Fair. Service is performed, but the quality and/or quantity of services does not meet the needs of the college or students.
3. Satisfactory. Service is performed in an acceptable manner, with room for improvement in quality or broadening of application.
4. Outstanding. Service is performed in an excellent manner. Difficult to improve either quality or quantity.

Please rate every service. Circle only one number or NP for each service.

1. Interpretation of standardized admission tests to beginning students to assist in planning their academic programs. NP 1 2 3 4
2. Administration and interpretation of diagnostic tests for basic scholastic skills, such as reading, writing, and mathematics. NP 1 2 3 4
3. Administration and interpretation of interest tests. NP 1 2 3 4
4. Use of tests for special vocational skills, such as mechanical aptitude or dexterity tests. NP 1 2 3 4
5. Conducting special studies for the purpose of improving services to students, to the faculty, or to the college. NP 1 2 3 4
6. Administration and interpretation of general ability or intelligence tests. NP 1 2 3 4
7. Administration and interpretation of personality tests. NP 1 2 3 4
8. Explanation of admission requirements and furnishing information about the college to individuals or groups. NP 1 2 3 4
9. Orientation to the campus and to college life. NP 1 2 3 4
10. Interpretation of course and scholastic requirements for particular academic programs. NP 1 2 3 4

11. Help with course selection for students transferring to a four-year institution. NP 1 2 3 4

12. Instruction in study skills, either with groups or individual students. NP 1 2 3 4

13. Interpretation of skills and special abilities needed for particular occupations. NP 1 2 3 4

14. Providing occupational information such as books, pamphlets, statistics, and the local and national employment outlook. NP 1 2 3 4

15. Help with personal - social - emotional problems. NP 1 2 3 4

16. Clarification of values, attitudes, personal goals, etc. NP 1 2 3 4

17. Assisting students with financial problems to find grants, part-time jobs, or loans, and to properly manage their finances. NP 1 2 3 4

18. Referral for remedial help with basic scholastic skills. NP 1 2 3 4

19. Liaison with both high schools and four-year colleges so students interested in transferring will have the necessary information to plan for program requirements. NP 1 2 3 4

20. Liaison with local business and industry employment representatives and state employment service. NP 1 2 3 4

21. Utilizing the services of a mental health clinic or other professional services for more severe personal problems. NP 1 2 3 4

22. Use of a psychometrist for intensive testing. NP 1 2 3 4

Appendix C

Letter of Introduction

Faculty Personal Data Sheet

Student Personal Data Sheet

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
A STATUTORY COLLEGE OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, N. Y. 14850

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STONE HALL

Dear Sir:

The enclosed questionnaires are part of a study being conducted by the Department of Education, Cornell University, in cooperation with the New York State Education Department. We are attempting to find out more about the counseling and guidance services offered to students in two-year colleges in New York.

Your frank, honest responses to the questionnaires will help us to complete the survey, and ultimately to make recommendations for improving guidance and counseling services for students in two-year colleges.

All of your responses are completely confidential. No data about individual persons or colleges will appear in the final report of the study. Please feel free to make comments or suggestions on the questionnaires wherever you feel this would be helpful.

The directions are self-explanatory. Please read the items carefully and respond to each item. Your prompt completion and return of the questionnaire within two days to the person who forwarded it to you will be appreciated. The questionnaire may be returned in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dalva E. Hedlund
Assistant Professor

College ____________________

FACULTY PERSONAL INFORMATION SHEET

Please checke the categories which describe you:

1. (1) Male.. 164
   (2) Female.. 50

2. (1) Full-time... 183
   (2) Evening class instructor................................ 21
   or
   (3) Part-time (other than evening classes).................. 11
   (4) If part-time, what percentage of your time is devoted to teaching at your institution?.............................. ____%

3. Highest academic degree held:
   (1) less than bachelors..................................... 12
   (2) Bachelors... 33
   (3) Masters... 153
   (4) Doctorate... 17

4. How many years have you taught (part-time or full-time) at this two-year college? (1-3).. 112
   (4-6)... 55
   (7-9)... 21
   (over 10)... 24

5. How many years total teaching experience (full-time equivalent at any level) have you had? (1-3).............................. 57
   (4-6)... 37
   (7-9)... 46
   (over 10)... 69

College________________________________

STUDENT PERSONAL INFORMATION SHEET

Please check the categories which describe you:

1. (1) Male.. 186
   (2) Female.. 130
2. (1) Full-time student.............................. 253
   (2) Part-time student (other than evening classes)....... 10
   (3) Evening class student......................... 53
3. Counting part-time enrollment as full-time attendance, are you a:
   (1) First year student.............................. 158
   or
   (2) Second year student........................... 142
4. (1) Are you in technical education - occupational major........... 144
   or
   (2) a general education - transfer major................ 136
5. Do you plan to transfer to a four-year college? (1) Yes.......... 220
   (2) No.......... 77
6. Do you live (1) at home............................ 226
   (2) away from home........................ 86
7. Please check the approximate number of times you have seen a professional counselor at your college for:
   (1) Personal counseling, other than registration (0)............. 103
   (1-3)............ 149
   (4 or more)...... 59

   (2) Testing program (aptitude test, interest inventories, achievement test, etc.) (0).......................... 189
   (1-3).............................. 108
   (4 or more).......................... 3

Appendix D

Inventory of Staff Resources

INVENTORY OF STAFF RESOURCES

Our purpose in the INVENTORY OF STAFF RESOURCES is to obtain an understanding of the experience and training of participating staff members. Your complete response to these items is needed. With your cooperation, we expect to make significant recommendations that will increase and strengthen opportunities for professional training. Please remember that all individual responses are completely confidential.

I Professional Experience

(1)________________ Name (2)________________ Institution (3)__________ Title (4)__________ Yrs. in Position

(5)________________ Next most recent position (6)________________ Institution (7)________________ Yrs. in Position

(8)________________ Next most recent position (9)________________ Institution (10)________________ Yrs. in position

11. Are you a full-time college staff member? (1) Yes................__________
(2) No................__________

12. What percentage of your professional time is given to activities associated with functions listed in the Inventory of Counseling Services?..............................__________

13. Do you classify yourself as a professional student personnel worker? (1) Yes..__________
(2) No..__________
(3) Not sure..__________

Please indicate in the appropriate spaces the number of years of experience in various assignments. (Include your current position.)

	Elementary Secondary	Junior College	Four-year College and University
A. Primarily Teaching	__________	________	__________
B. Primarily Student Personnel Work	__________	________	__________
C. Primarily Administration (Non-Student Personnel)	__________	________	__________

Total years of educational experience: __________

II Formal Education

(1)______________________ (2)______________ (3)__________ (4)__________
Undergraduate Institution   Major   Degree   Year of Graduation

5. Approximate number of undergraduate credits in:
(semester hours; quarters hours equal two-thirds of semester hours)
(1) Education_____ (2) Psychology_____ (3) other social sciences_________

Graduate Education

Course Work:

(6) Institution____________________ (7) Major________________________
(8) Total semester hours____________ (9) Degree, if any________________

(10) Institution___________________ (11) Major_______________________
(12) Total semester hours___________ (13) Degree, if any_______________

(14) Institution___________________ (15) Major_______________________
(16) Total semester hours___________ (17) Degree, if any_______________

Special Workshops or Institutes in Counseling or Guidance:

(18) Title of workshop_____________ (19) Number of weeks_______________
(20) Title of workshop_____________ (21) Number of weeks_______________
(22) Title of workshop_____________ (23) Number of weeks_______________

Supervised Practicum

24. Did you have a supervised practicum? (1) Yes_________ (2) No___________

25. Institution_____________________ 26. No. of Credits_______________

27. Setting: (1) Elementary_______ (2) Secondary________ (3) Jr. College____
(4) University or 4 year college_______ (5) Medical Clinic______
(6) Other________

28. Please indicate emphasis of the practicum:
(1) Primarily supervised counseling.............................._________
(2) Primarily other student personnel services...................._________
(3) Equally counseling and other student personnel services........_________

29. Distribution of Graduate Work

Please check the areas in which you have had graduate course work.

(1) Counseling interview.................................__________
(2) Clinical testing.....................................__________
(3) Educational testing..................................__________
(4) Group guidance (includes group dynamics).............__________
(5) Occupational information.............................__________
(6) Research methodology (include statistics, thesis, dissertation)__________
(7) Other student personnel and guidance (excluding (1) through (6)__________
(8) Occupational education...............................__________
(9) Higher education.....................................__________
(10) Other education.....................................__________
(11) Cognate courses (psychology, sociology, anthropology)........__________

30. Evaluation of Graduate Experiences

(1) In relationship to your current job assignment--What were the most significant graduate experiences or courses?

____

____

____

(2) What were the least helpful graduate experiences or courses?

____

____

31. Profession Opportunities

(1) Have you had any on-the-job training or supervision (non-credit) in any junior college in which you have been employed? (1) Yes.__________
(2) No..__________

(2) If yes, please describe where, when, and the nature of the training or supervision:

____

____

____

III Work Time Estimate

Estimate the percentage of your total work time that you spend on the following types of functions. The sub-headings are suggestive only, not exhaustive, and are not intended to mean that you necessarily perform all the duties in a given category.

(1) Orientation Functions.. ________%

Dissemination of information to prospective students, information giving to groups--associated with induction into college, effective study skills, vocational decisions, educational planning, rules and regulations, etc.

(2) Appraisal Functions.. ________%

Maintenance of student records
Testing of achievement, aptitudes, interests, etc.
Making of individual case studies, etc.

(3) Consultation Functions.. ________%

Professional services to students individually and in groups in clarifying basic values, attitudes, interests, and abilities; all phases of decision-making; formulating educational-vocational plans; identifying and resolving problems interfering with plans and progress; referring to appropriate resources for more intensive and deep-seated personal problems.

(4) Participation Functions.. ________%

Advising student government organizations, conducting government leadership programs, etc.
Arranging for cultural activities; sponsoring of clubs and organizations; organizing special interest groups and other co-curricular activities, etc.

(5) Regulation Functions.. ________%

Student registration procedures; Handling student infraction of college rules; Supervision of student social activities; Dealing with student petitions.

(6) Service Functions.. ________%

Financial aids service; Placement service.

(7) Organizational Functions.. ________%

Articulation with other institutions; Administration of student personnel services; In-service education of staff members; evaluation, etc.

(8) Other Functions.. ________%

(Use only if a function is not implied in above groups. If used, please describe functions briefly below. For example, teaching one course per semester.)

Total: 100%

(9) Of the total time you spend in counseling activities (100%) what percentage is devoted to (1) Full-time students........................________%

(2) Part-time day students..................________%

(3) Evening students........................________%

COMMENTS: Your personal comments on your previous education, what further training you need, difficulties and problems your college counseling service has, and suggestions for improving counseling services in your college are welcomed and encouraged.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Please put the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return to the Dean of Students Office or to the person who forwarded it to you.

Appendix E

Institutional Information Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS TO CAMPUS COORDINATOR

1. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire entitled "Information About the Institution and Student Body." Where estimates of numbers or percentages are required use the best source you can find for these figures. Where your opinion or experience is required to answer an item, be as complete and objective as possible in arriving at an answer. For instance, you may wish to consult with someone else when indicating what happens to dropouts from your college. Be sure to include yourself, if applicable, under the item asking for names of members of the student personnel staff.

   When you have questions about the appropriate base numbers for total enrollment or other figures, use those figures reported to the Division of Institutional Research, SUNY, in the Fall of 1967.

2. It will be necessary to obtain a random sample of students and faculty at your college. We will draw the sample of individuals to send questionnaires to, if you will accomplish the following steps:

   (a) Obtain a complete list of all students at your college (including full-time, part-time, and evening students). A student directory may be adequate, if available.

   (b) Obtain a complete list of the faculty at your college (again including full-time, part-time, and evening instructors).

   (c) Forward the completed "Information About the Institution and Student Body," plus the student and faculty lists to Cornell in the enclosed envelope. The student and faculty lists will be returned to you if requested.

   (d) Should you not be able to obtain a complete listing of students or faculty to send us, please call immediately (607-275-2063) so we can make different sampling plans for your college.

3. We will send you questionnaires for counselors, selected students, and selected faculty members at your college. These questionnaires will be addressed to individuals included in the sample. All you need do is see that they are distributed to the proper individuals.

4. Each individual student, faculty member, and counselor will complete his questionnaire, seal it in the enclosed envelope, and return it to you. When all or most of the questionnaires are returned to you, you will simply package them and mail the package to us (1st class postage). We will be in contact with you prior to this last stage of data collection.

5. Time is very important in the collection of the data. You are urged to use the telephone for any questions or problems you may have, and to give your immediate attention to the study. With as many colleges as are participating in the study a delay of a few days on individual campuses can lead to a delay of weeks in completing the study.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTION AND STUDENT BODY

College____________________

Address____________________

President____________________

Office Address____________________

Academic Dean____________________

Office Address____________________

Dean of Students (if any)____________________

Office Address____________________

Person designated to coordinate the Cornell survey at your college:

Names____________________

Position____________________

Office Address____________________

Telephone____________________

1. Please use Fall, 1967, figures as reported to SUNY.

(1) Total student enrollment.......................................________

(2) Number of men.......................................________

(3) Number of women.......................................________

(4) Number enrolled as full-time students (12 hours or more)..........________

(5) Number enrolled as part-time students (less than 12 hours), excluding evening students.......................................________

(6) Number of students enrolled in evening classes only...............________

2. Of all students currently enrolled at your college, and counting part-time enrollment as full attendance, what percentage are:

   (1) in their first year of attendance at your college..............________%

   (2) in their second year of attendance at your college.............________%

   (3) currently in their third or more year of attendance at your college...________%

3. Approximate number of full-time students who are married: Men________

   Women________

4. Approximate number of full-time students 20 years of age or older...________

5. Percent of full-time students receiving financial aid administered by your college, excluding Scholar Incentive and Regents Scholarships and including on-campus part-time work.........................________

6. Homes of students:

   Please indicate the percentages of full-time students who:

   (1) live at home...________%

   (2) live away from home..________%

7. In your judgement, what are the main reasons why some students shift from one curriculum to another?

   ____

   ____

   ____

   (Use reverse side of sheet, if more space is needed.)

8. Of every 100 newly enrolled, full-time freshmen in your college, estimate as closely as possible how many:

   (1) leave during the first year without completing a program of study...________%

   (2) complete a program of study during the first year...............________%

   (3) leave during the second year without completing a program of study...________%

   (4) complete a program of study during the second year..............________%

   Total ____100____%

9. In your experience, what are the main reasons why some students leave your college without graduating?

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

   (Use reverse side of this sheet, if more space is needed.)

10. Please estimate the total number of students during 66/67 school year who:
(1) transferred to a four-year institution.............. __________
(2) transferred to other than a four-year institution.... __________
(3) entered gainful employment.......................... __________

11. The Dropouts

If you have information (formal or informal) about your dropouts, please state below what happens to them or what they tend to do after they leave your institution:

____

____

____

____

____

(Use reverse side of this sheet, if more space is needed.)

12. Please list those agencies which have accredited your college:

____

____

____

13. Number of teaching faculty:
(1) Full-time......................... __________
(2) Part-time
(a) in day division............... __________
(b) in evening division........... __________

Academic degrees of teaching faculty:

	Number of: Full-time	Number of: Part-time
with Doctorate........	(1)________	(4)__________
with Masters..........	(2)________	(5)__________
with less than Masters	(3)________	(6)__________

14. Student Personnel Staff

Please list below the names and titles of all the full-and part-time members of the student personnel staff.

Full time (check one)	Part time (check one)	Name	Title	% of Estimated total time in counseling
( )	( )	____________________	____________________	________
( )	( )	____________________	____________________	________
( )	( )	____________________	____________________	________
( )	( )	____________________	____________________	________

(Use reverse side of sheet, if more space is needed.)

15. Please explain the organization and administration of the student personnel program at your college. For example, who is responsible for the overall program?

____

____

What are the formal lines of authority?

____

____

Does the individual in charge have major responsibilities in other areas of administration?

____

____

Please provide an organizational chart.

Appendix F

Participating Colleges

Participating Colleges

Auburn Community College
Broome Technical Community College
Corning Community College
Dutchess Community College
Fashion Institutue of Technology
Jamestown Community College
Jefferson Community College
Kingsborough Community College
Mohawk Valley Community College
Nassau Community College
New York City Community College
Onondaga Community College
Orange County Community College
Queensborough Community College
Staten Island Community College
Suffolk County Community College
Sullivan County Community College
SUNY Agricultural and Technical College at Alfred
SUNY Agricultural and Technical College at Canton
SUNY Agricultural and Technical College at Cobleskill
SUNY Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi
SUNY Agricultural and Technical College at Farmingdale
SUNY Agricultural and Technical College at Morrisville
Genesee Community College
Community College of the Finger Lakes